

**THE HIGHLAND COUNCIL**  
**CITY OF INVERNESS AREA COMMITTEE**

**2 SEPTEMBER 2014**

Agenda Item	6
Report No	CIA/34/14

**DRAFT INSHES AND RAIGMORE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF**

**Report by Director of Development and Infrastructure**

**Summary**

This report outlines the content of a draft development brief for the Inshes and Raigmore area of the city of Inverness. This planning policy document is required to guide land use opportunities and related strategic and local transport network improvements in the area. The draft brief is contained in Appendix A for Members approval. Its preparation has been informed by a public consultation on 'Issues & Options' held earlier this year, and the recommended responses to the comments received are set out in Appendix B also for Members approval. After a consultation and further Committee approval process, it is intended that the brief will be adopted as a statutory part of the Council's Development Plan.

**1. Background**

- 1.1 The Council's Highland-wide Local Development Plan (HwLDP) (2012) provides a spatial strategy for Inverness. It identifies Inshes and Raigmore as a regeneration area in the city where transport network improvements are key to the future development of the area. The HwLDP sets out the need for a development brief to be prepared for this area in order to guide development and allow a co-ordinated approach to infrastructure delivery. A draft development brief (enclosed in Appendix A) has now been completed and is presented to this Committee for approval for public consultation. The draft development brief has been informed by an earlier consultation on 'Issues and Options' in the area. A summary of comments received during the consultation and recommended Council responses is contained in Appendix B for Members approval.
- 1.2 In addition to preparing a development brief for the area, the Council is currently progressing plans for improvements to the local transport network, a project known as Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2. The outline proposals for this scheme were presented as part of the Issues & Options consultation. In recognition of the links between local and trunk roads in this area, Council officers have also been working closely with Transport Scotland in taking a proactive and joined up approach to addressing transport issues. Transport Scotland ran a consultation on their A9/A96 Connections Study in parallel with the Council's Issues & Options consultation. The Council's recommended response to the Transport Scotland study is also being presented to this Committee today.

1.3 Further information on the outcome of the Issues & Options consultation in respect of the development brief and Inshes Junction Improvements is provided in sections 2 and 3 of this report respectively. The content of the draft brief is outlined in section 4 and finally next steps for both the development brief and Inshes Junctions Improvements Phase 2 are explained in section 5. Implications are contained in section 6.

## 2. Issues and Options Consultation

2.1 At the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Committee meeting of 14 May 2014 members agreed the material to form the basis of an Issues & Options public consultation. The report was taken to a strategic committee mainly due to the timescales set out by Transport Scotland for their public consultation which was being held in parallel. However, the draft development brief and the finalised development brief are being reported to this committee and will be taken back to the strategic committee for final statutory approval. The next stage of Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 will be progressed once the preferred A9/A96 route has been announced by Transport Scotland.

2.2 The Issues & Options consultation ran from 30 May to 31 July 2014. During this time two public exhibitions/drop-in sessions were held that were facilitated by Council planning and transportation officers and representatives from Transport Scotland. The consultation was widely publicised in a number of ways:

- by writing to residents and businesses in and around the area covered by the development brief and the Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2, as well as those on the development plans team mailing list;
- by placing notices in local press;
- by circulating posters; and
- through social media.

2.3 The Issues & Options consultation events were well attended, with approximately 300 interested parties, including members of the public, Councillors, landowners, developers and agents in attendance. Members of the public were invited to provide written feedback by using a single feedback form (available in hard copy or online) for both of the Council projects. The Council received 45 direct, written responses to the consultation with summaries of development brief comments in paragraphs 2.4-2.8 and junction improvements comments in Section 3 below. A verbatim copy of the comments received can be viewed on the Council's website and has also been placed in the Member's lounge.

2.4 Of the responses received, 33 respondents provided comments directly related to the development brief. A summary of the comments and the Council's recommended response is provided in Appendix A, and an overview is provided below:

2.5 **Local residents** generally agreed with built and natural heritage, water and flood risk and infrastructure constraints shown in the Council's analysis and suggested additional constraints that should be identified. Some raised concern regarding the extent to which constraints were taken into account in development proposals.

Proposed walking, cycling and public transport improvements were also generally supported. Concerns were raised regarding safety issues associated with shared use paths. A small number of other improvements were recommended. The guidelines for the two development sites received mostly positive feedback, but with some concern over the potential impact on mature trees. Several respondents also requested that a vacant site within a southern section of the retail park was recognised and given priority for development. General concerns were also raised regarding the potential for increased traffic generation and congestion resulting from additional development.

2.6 **Landowners and developers** generally agreed with the constraints illustrated but requested acknowledgement that there are likely to be encroachments into these areas to fulfil the wider intentions of the brief. In terms of walking, cycling and public transport it was highlighted that the suggested improvement routes are subject to change dependant on the outcome of the Council and Transport Scotland's transport network improvement studies. Several other amendments were suggested including:

- expansion of the development brief area include land to the west of Sir Walter Scott Drive until it reaches the roundabout at the entrance to Inshes Retail Park;
- less prescriptive development guidelines, in particular at the Dell of Inshes site;
- recognition of the remaining development site within a southern section of the retail park and inclusion of timescales for delivery of Inshes Junction Improvements.

2.7 **Inverness South Community Council** generally agreed with the content of the issues and options paper but raised concerns about drainage, flooding and increased traffic. **Westhill Community Council** raised concerns regarding potential safety issues associated with shared use paths and queried the effectiveness of the first phase of Inshes Junction Improvements. They also raised concern over increased traffic congestion as a result of a bus gate on Millburn Road and the lack of a dedicated entrance to Inverness Campus from the A9(T), and advocated the use of pedestrian/cycle underpasses to reduce traffic congestion.

2.8 **Other public agencies and interest groups** requested recognition of green networks and their potential for enhancement and incorporation of active travel routes; the requirement for species surveys and flood risk assessments; the need for additional access to Inverness Campus; and the suitability of identified paths for shared use and incorporation of additional active travel improvements.

2.9 As a result of the consultation the draft brief includes reference to several new matters relevant to development in the area along with additional detail relating to issues and challenges previously outlined. These are described in Appendix B and are summarised as follows:

- identification of green network enhancement opportunities;
- additional opportunities for active travel and public transport improvements;
- inclusion of land within a southern section of the retail park as a development

- opportunity;
- priority for completion of the existing retail park prior to any expansion; and
- detailed requirements for the delivery of development opportunities.

### 3. Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 – Outline Proposals

- 3.1 As outlined previously in this report the Council's issues and options consultation included outline proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2. A total of 34 responses were received that directly related to Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 outline proposals. A summary of views expressed is provided below:
- 3.2 **Local residents and members of the public** generally agreed with the constraints raised, and provided helpful comments and suggestions. Several respondents were supportive of the proposals. Several raised concerns over replacing the Fluke and Inshes roundabouts with junctions, and increasing the number of traffic lights along the B9006. These measures were considered to have potential to increase traffic congestion.
- 3.3 A number of respondents also raised road safety concerns associated with changes to roundabouts. Priority for pedestrians and cyclists was raised, with suggestions that cyclists be afforded equal priority to traffic, and that dedicated segregated cycle ways be considered. Closure of the junction to Drakies at Raigmore Motel from the B9006 received mixed responses. Some welcomed the idea to prevent vehicles using this as an alternative through-route, whilst others raised concerns over limiting access for Drakies residents, the potential for increased congestion on Drumossie Avenue, and increased parking on Old Perth Road.
- 3.4 A large proportion of respondents, whilst generally supportive of the flood attenuation measures west of Tesco, raised the issue of a loss of green space and the importance of retaining mature trees and vegetation. Some respondents suggested that the evidence base upon which proposals had been formed should be made publicly available. Local residents and members of the public suggested various alternative solutions that will be taken into account in the preparation of detailed designs for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.
- 3.5 **Landowners and developers** were supportive of replacing the Fluke and Inshes roundabouts with junctions, but suggested that passing trade to the retail park (Tesco and Tesco filling station) may be impacted. They raised the issue of loss of residents' access by closing the Raigmore Motel junction to Old Perth Road, and the potential for causing more congestion by increasing the number of traffic lights. There was a request for the alternative access to the Police HQ to be retained only under the site's current use, and to be removed in the event that the site turns to general business use. Landowners and developers welcomed the consultation, and expressed interest in continuing to be engaged as the proposals develop.
- 3.6 **Culcabock and Drakies Community Council** raised concerns over increased use of Old Perth Road for parking with the proposal to close the junction at Raigmore Motel. They also perceived that closing this junction would restrict access for Drakies residents, and cause potential congestion/ increased traffic on Drumossie Avenue. They raised concerns that replacing the Fluke roundabout with a junction

could cause more congestion than it alleviates, and requested that any pedestrian crossings be at a standard fit for use by disabled people.

- 3.7 **Inverness South Community Council** was generally supportive of the proposals, but suggested that the best access to Police HQ is that currently marked as the alternative (south). They suggested more thought be given to entrances and exits to the Inverness Campus, and that as many trees as possible be retained during development.
- 3.8 **Westhill Community Council** was not supportive of replacing roundabouts with junctions, and suggested that changing the entrances onto Inshes roundabout at Tesco could alleviate many of the current problems. They also urged the Council to consider the proposed changes to Inshes overbridge to be phased as a first priority.
- 3.9 **Other public agencies and interest groups** suggested segregated cycle ways and urged the council to provide the best active travel opportunities in Inverness. They also supported an increase in the capacity of Inshes overbridge, and suggested that the Drakies and Tesco filling station access changes could alleviate many of the current problems. A request was made for proposals to take into account changes in hydrological regimes and runoff, and therefore flood mitigation. There were also suggestions for various alternative solutions that will be considered through the preparation of detailed designs for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.
- 3.10 These comments will be considered through the preparation of detailed designs for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2. These will be progressed following Transport Scotland announcement of a preferred route for the A9/A96 Connections Study. To ensure that a joined up approach is being taken to the development brief and the transport improvements, the brief specifies that land identified in the outline proposals drawings for the Council's transport and flood alleviation scheme must be safeguarded from development.

#### **4 Content of Draft Development Brief**

- 4.1 The draft Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief, attached as Appendix A, builds upon key challenges outlined in the earlier issues and options paper to provide additional detail on land use opportunities, as well as introducing new aspects to the brief as a result of the public consultation described above. The brief provides a framework to address key challenges and opportunities in the area, principally:
- The delivery of increased capacity on the local transport network to relieve congestion and accommodate future development by safeguarding land for the delivery of Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2;
  - A solution to reduce flood risk and associated with the Dell Burn by safeguarding land for flood attenuation and defences;
  - Links with Transport Scotland's A9/A96 Connections Study by identifying the location of route options within the brief area;
  - Improved walking, cycling and public transport connections by identifying active travel network improvement opportunities and potential new bus routes;
  - Identification of green network enhancement opportunities;

- Completion of the existing Inshes Retail Park by supporting development at the southern end of retail park prior to any expansion at Dell of Inshes;
- Integrated and sustainable expansion of Inshes Retail Park by expanding the range of services available to local communities and businesses and helping to enable infrastructure improvements; and
- Enabling business development at land south of Police Scotland that will create employment opportunities and developing safer active travel routes.

4.2 Members may be aware that a planning application (reference: 13/04334/PIP) has been submitted to the Council for land at Dell of Inshes for mixed use development comprising retail, financial professional and other services and food and drink uses, public house/restaurant, community allotments and associated works. The applicant has been informed that the Council considers the application premature as it has been submitted prior to finalisation of the development brief and the Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2. Agreement has been reached with the applicant to postpone the determination of the planning application until the preparation of the development brief has moved on sufficiently to guide decision making.

4.3 The development brief has been assessed against Policy 1 (Promoting and Protecting City and Town Centres) of the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan agreed by Committee in May 2014. This policy identifies Inshes Retail Park as a district centre. As such the developer will be required to justify any development against the sequential approach set out in this policy. Furthermore the development brief seeks to deliver proposals that are complementary to the existing uses at Inshes Retail Park.

## **5 Next Steps**

5.1 The development brief will establish the Council's detailed planning policy for the area and it will be vital to future planning decisions in the area and important in respect of other supporting proposals associated with Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 and Transport Scotland's A9/A96 Connections Study. Once finalised and adopted as supplementary guidance it will form part of the Council's Development Plan.

5.2 The proposed consultation period for the draft Brief will run for a minimum of six weeks, and during the early stages it is intended to hold an afternoon public exhibition followed by an open evening meeting at a venue within the brief area. The consultation will be widely publicised by writing to residents and businesses within and adjacent to the brief area as well as those who responded to the Issues & Options consultation and those on the development plans team mailing list, by placing notices in local press and by using social media.

- 5.3 The milestones and timescales for preparing the development brief are outlined in the table below.

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Timescale</b>
Public consultation on draft development brief	September – November 2014
Report back findings of consultation and final development brief to City of Inverness Area Committee; begin statutory adoption procedures	December 2014
Adoption as statutory supplementary guidance at Planning, Development and Infrastructure Committee	January 2015

- 5.4 Due to the layout of the Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 Scheme being linked to the preferred option selected by Transport Scotland in respect of the A9/A96 link, a detailed timetable for the project delivery can only be established on confirmation of a preferred route. Once the preferred A9/A96 route has been announced by Transport Scotland a paper on the Inshes Junction Improvement Phase 2 proposals will be brought to committee for approval.

## **6 Implications**

### **6.1 Environmental implications**

The brief will be required to undergo due process with regards to Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulation Appraisal. These processes have commenced and will be concluded at an appropriate time.

### **6.2 Resources implications**

Resources to deliver the development brief are available from the Development and Infrastructure Service budget. Resources to develop the proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 are contained within the Council's Capital Programme.

### **6.3 Equality implications**

In regard to equalities, any design for development will take into account access requirements for individuals with disabilities and vulnerable user groups.

### **6.4 Carbon Clever and climate change implications**

The development brief and Inshes Junction Improvement Phase 2 will look at the wider active travel connections from Inshes and Raigmore to other key destinations in the city. This will help to mitigate the impact of climate change by reducing traffic congestion, improving journey times and supporting active travel and cycle routes thereby reducing the carbon footprint of the city and contributing to the carbon clever initiatives.

### **6.5 Legal, rural and Gaelic implications**

There are no known direct legal, rural or Gaelic implications arising from this report.

## **Recommendation**

Committee is invited to:

- note the comments received to the Issues and Options consultation and agree the recommended Council responses contained in Appendix A; and
- agree Appendix B as the content of the Draft Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief to be subject to public consultation.

Designation: Director of Development & Infrastructure

Date: 21 August 2014

Authors: Lynn Clarke/Tim Stott/Scott Dalgarno/Malcolm Macleod

Background Papers:

- Highland-wide Local Development Plan (2012)
- Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan (2013)
- Report to City of Inverness Area Committee on 9 December 2013 - Update on Development Briefs for Regeneration of Sites in Inverness
- Report to Planning, Development and Infrastructure Committee on 14 May 2014 - Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief – Issues and Options and Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 Consultation



APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON INSHES AND RAIGMORE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF – ISSUES AND OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDED RESPONSES

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<b>Question 1: What do you think about the constraints shown? Are there any others?</b>		
<b>A Kidd</b>	Wishes Transport Scotland's likely connection from the A9 to Aldi roundabout through to the Southern Distributor Road to be protected by a buffer. Considers this would best be achieved with a direct link to a new roundabout on the Southern Distributor Road at the rear of the Police Scotland building.	<p>The infrastructure constraints drawing in the issues and options paper illustrates a 25 metre buffer of key roads. This includes the A9(T), the Southern Distributor Road and Culloeden Road. A dashed line with no buffer illustrates the location of the Transport Scotland route option. Given the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study is currently at a route options stage it would not be appropriate for the Council to insist that either land and/or a buffer for the route option is safeguarded from development. However, to provide additional clarity the draft brief provides a clearer illustration and description of the route options that lie partially within the development brief area and the potential implications of this.</p> <p>In terms of a direct link to a new roundabout on the Southern Distributor Road to the rear of the Police Scotland building, the presence of existing built development, areas covered by a tree preservation order and other technical constraints may predicate such a link being created. Nevertheless, these comments are being shared with Transport Scotland who are the decision making body for the A9/A96 Connections Study. Transport Scotland will therefore consider this suggestion in more detail.</p>
<b>J Gordon</b>	Review bus stop at Raigmore Filing Station because it is a potential congestion point due to the number of buses that pass through the area.	This comment relates to a detailed transportation matter that will be considered further by the Council in progressing Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.
<b>D Morrison</b>	Notes options are well considered.	Noted.
<b>A Cox</b>	No further constraints. Supports retention of green spaces and mature trees. Disappointed mature tree were felled between Matalan and Dobbies.	<p>Noted. The brief will continue to reflect Scottish Planning Policy and the policies of the High-wide Local Development Plan by presuming in favour of the retention of protected green spaces and mature trees. Where retention is not possible compensatory provision/planting must be provided.</p> <p>As part of a planning application (ref: 12/03499/FUL) for 'external alterations to the Tesco and former Focus units and extension to form new outdoor plant sales, and associated alterations to service yard, access and parking', the Council accepted the loss of beech trees between Matalan and Dobbies. This was on the basis of appropriate mitigation and compensatory planting being provided.</p>
<b>H&amp;I Barclay</b>	Concerned about cyclists using pavements due to risk of accidents with pedestrians. Questions who would be liable if a pedestrian was injured. Notes that cycle lanes on Culcabock Road are seldom used due to heavy traffic and the narrowness of the road.	Concerns regarding shared use paths are noted and are considered further the Council's response to comments received to question 2 below. In terms of liability, this is generally dealt with on a case by case basis in the event of an accident. With regards to Culcabock Road, improvements to active travel in this area may be considered as part of the proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<b>Inverness South Community Council</b>	Content with constraints as presented.	Noted.
<b>L Cload</b>	<p>Generally content with constraints as presented. Considers development brief boundary should be enlarged to include land affected by Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study.</p> <p>Requests consideration is given to changes to the key roads when the West Link road opens and the avoidance of bottlenecks.</p> <p>Questions the following omissions from constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration for traffic capacity as an infrastructure constraint – i.e Raigmore Roundabout which is currently at capacity;</li> <li>• Old Perth Road as a key road given it is proposed to be upgraded; and</li> <li>• Recognition that SUDs pond on Woodgrove Drive area quickly fills to capacity leading to overland flow issues on Woodgrove Drive and to the Tesco roundabout.</li> </ul>	<p>A separate development brief will be prepared by the Council for Ashton Farm in East Inverness which is affected by the A9/A96 Connections Study. Preparation of this brief cannot begin until the announcement of a preferred route by Transport Scotland. As there is currently particular development pressure in the Inshes/Raigmore area of Inverness, in particular, a pending planning application for a mixed use development at Dell of Inshes, it is important that a development brief for Inshes and Raigmore is prepared in advance of a development brief for Ashton Farm.</p> <p>The Council and/or Transport Scotland may undertake additional traffic modelling work to further assess future traffic flows in the city as a result of development and infrastructure proposals, including completion of the West Link to inform later stages of their respective transport studies.</p> <p>In terms of constraint omissions, the following explanations are provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The infrastructure constraints drawing shown in the issues and options paper was intended to illustrate physical constraints rather than traffic capacity constraints. The draft brief acknowledges congestion issues at the Inshes Roundabout and that increased capacity is required to accommodate future development;</li> <li>• Old Perth Road was not identified as a key road with a 25 metre buffer due to the proximity of existing, mainly residential, development that encroaches this buffer; and</li> <li>• The water and flood risk drawing illustrates the extent of surface water flooding shown in the SEPA flood maps. Fluvial flooding is excluded as this is not identified on the SEPA flood maps within the development brief area. This is due to the water courses within the brief area being of insufficient size to be recorded on SEPA's mapping. In the absence of evidence that illustrates the extent and frequency of flooding at this location, it is not appropriate for the development brief area to be mapped as a flood risk area.</li> </ul>
<b>D&amp;J Whillis</b>	Agrees with the following constraints: green space, historic importance and significant flood risk.	Noted. These features are continued to be recognised in the draft development brief with any adverse impacts resulting from the proposals shall be minimised or mitigated wherever possible.
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage</b>	<p>Welcomes identification of green space for example protected open space and 20m buffer of trees.</p> <p>Suggests green space associated with Raigmore Hospital Campus could also be shown as protected open space due to its therapeutic value.</p>	<p>Noted. These features are continued to be recognised in the draft development brief with any adverse impacts resulting from the proposals shall be minimised or mitigated wherever possible.</p> <p>There are several pockets of green space within Raigmore Hospital Campus, the largest of which is located in the north western corner of the campus. Currently the development plan does not identify any of areas of open space within the brief for amenity use/protected open space. As none of the areas of green spaces appear to be well used, fit for purpose open spaces it would not be appropriate</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>Enlarged Dell of Inshes area in south east part of development brief area has potential for badger habitat; connects to 'green wedge' continuing south east towards Balvonie.</p> <p>Recommends badger survey should be required for development at Dell of Inshes.</p>	<p>for the brief to safeguard these areas from development. Rather, it provides a level of protection for these areas by identifying them as potential areas for green network enhancement and where relevant, active travel improvement. Furthermore, it is also important that the brief provides a degree of flexibility for any future reconfiguration of the hospital campus, including redevelopment of its' on site accommodation.</p> <p>The requirement for a badger survey is noted and is included as a developer requirement for the Dell of Inshes site in the brief.</p>
<p><b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b></p>	<p>Concern that significant tree belts south of the Police Scotland; east of the Tesco supermarket car park; and north of the Woodgrove housing development are not given much weight in the development proposals and no justification is given for their removal that is backed up by tree constraints survey information.</p> <p>Concern this approach is inconsistent with approach to private developments where trees are affected as approval is rarely received from Council Forestry Officers. Wants fair and consistent application of Council Supplementary Guidance on Trees and Development for the area proposals.</p>	<p>The built and natural heritage constraints drawings illustrate that a 20m buffer of existing trees are a constraint to development south of Police Scotland; east of the Tesco supermarket car park and north of the Woodgrove housing development. The outline proposal drawings for Inshes Junction Improvements, development guidelines and Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study route options, indicate that there may be some impact on trees in these areas as a result of development. Potential tree impacts will be investigated when detailed designs are developed for Inshes Junction Improvements (including flood defences and attenuation) and a route option has been selected by Transport Scotland. The development guidelines in the brief have been amended to make clear that there is likely to impacts on trees as a result of development, that the loss of trees should be minimised and compensatory planting may be required.</p> <p>Impacts on trees will be assessed in the same way any proposals from private developers are, i.e. in consultation with Council Forestry Officers and in line with the development plan, including the Council's Supplementary Guidance on Trees and Development.</p>
<p><b>Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)</b></p>	<p>Notes response should be read in conjunction with previous comments received in March 2014 and response on Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.</p> <p><i>Flood risk</i> Pleased that water and flooding are identified as constraints. Strongly recommend that areas: that have flooded previously; are near to watercourses or culverts or within limits of flooding on the SEPA Flood Maps medium probability outlines, including surface water extent, required a flood risk assessment to support development proposals. Suggests this could form a joint flood risk assessment with Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.</p> <p>Alternatively, could recommend all sites within development brief area require a Level 1 screening flood risk study, as outlined Council's</p>	<p>The development brief continues to identify constraints associated with water and flood risk. It is agreed that a flood risk assessment should be required to accompany development proposals in the area and is stipulated as a requirement for the development opportunity sites identified at Dell of Inshes and Land South of Police Scotland. Reference to the flood risk assessment considering the impact of any potential realignment of the Dell Burn will also be referred to in relation to the requirement for a flood risk assessment for the site at Dell of Inshes where the Dell Burn runs parallel to its western boundary. Given the likely differing timing of development and resources, it is not considered appropriate for a flood risk assessment for the entire brief area to be undertaken at this time.</p> <p>The brief acknowledges the presence of potential drainage issues throughout the area, in particular the presence of culverts and the requirement for these to be properly maintained to reduce the risk of flooding.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>Supplementary Guidance on Flood Risk &amp; Drainage Impact Assessment. This would indicate whether more detailed flood risk assessment work is required and what the scope of the work would be.</p> <p>Would be advantageous to provide a full flood risk assessment for development brief area prior to submitting individual applications. Without an assessment of flood risk for the whole site, further applications may be limited in their scope for development.</p> <p>Note that proposed road improvement works could potentially impact on the alignment of the Dell Burn. The flood risk assessment for the site should consider the impact of any potential realignment of the Dell Burn. Changes to the watercourse alignment may be constrained by areas of existing development and may make site layout options more limited.</p> <p>Welcomes requirement for built development to be set back from watercourses, and that land will be safeguarded for flood storage and defences at Inshes.</p> <p>Recommend that drainage issues throughout the area are investigated and culverts are properly maintained to reduce the risk of flooding. Presumes that consultation will have already taken place with flood risk authority colleagues on the proposals as they will hold information.</p> <p>Will provide additional advice once more detailed flood risk information is available.</p> <p><i>Foul drainage</i> Availability of existing foul drainage infrastructure may be a constraint, even just temporarily. Request statement in the development brief outlining the need for early engagement with Scottish Water and confirming that all areas must connect to the foul sewer.</p>	<p>The brief includes a statement that outlines the need for early engagement with Scottish Water and that all areas must be connected to the foul sewer.</p>
<b>B Hill</b>	<p>Considers constraints shown are entirely justified. Wishes high priority to be given to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Drainage and flooding risks; and</li> </ol>	<p>The brief continues to give high priority to drainage and flooding risks by highlighting the presence of water and flood risk constraints and requiring proposals for development to be accompanied by a drainage impact assessment and flood risk assessment. With regards to noise, any requirement for</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	2. Noise insulation for residential and leisure areas.	assessment and mitigation is dependant upon the nature of uses proposed. The brief requires that dependant upon the proposals and their proximity to residential areas a noise impact assessment should be undertaken and if necessary, mitigation provided which could include noise attenuation.
<b>D Donald</b>	Considers that constraints set out by planners tend to be unrealistic as they are limited to the defined area and do not consider repercussions on adjacent areas and do not take into account advice from civil engineers when they do not agree with Planners.	The constraints to development drawings in the issues and options paper were mapped using reliable sources of information. The development plan provides a policy framework that ensures these constraints are taken into account in development proposals. In terms of repercussions on adjacent areas, where relevant, for example transport, hydrological or other cumulative impacts, are fully assessed as part of development proposals. All comments received to consultations are fully considered and reported to the relevant Council Committee for consideration by members.
<b>Goodson Associates (Acting on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited)</b>	Considers main constraints are identified.	Noted.
<b>I Stewart</b>	<p>Considers constraints drawings are too small scale to be easily interpreted but all relevant constraints appear to be adequately considered.</p> <p>Queries if blue mark represents on 'All Constraints' map is related to flood prevention.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the constraints drawings were provided at a relatively small scale in the issues and options paper and that may make them difficult to interpret. Larger, more easy to interpret drawings are provided in the draft development brief.</p> <p>It is accepted that it was unclear what the blue mark on the all constraints map represented. This map is not provided in the draft brief and further explanation is provided on the emerging flood attenuation and defences proposals.</p>
<b>J Shankland</b>	Concerned that 'white area' developments may result in too much built up developments and not enough green space.	The 'all constraints' drawing shows some large areas of white space and the associated text explains that these areas may have potential for development. It is accepted that this drawing may be somewhat misleading as it neglects to show any green spaces and illustrates some 'white areas' that do not have potential for development, for example Raigmore Hospital car park. This drawing is not shown in the draft brief for these reasons. Rather, the opportunities drawing in the brief more clearly illustrates the location of development opportunities and green spaces.
<b>Highland Cycle Campaign</b>	Highland Cycle Campaign wishes to see a modal shift from motorised vehicles to cycling and walking. Have been making the case for this on health, environmental, social inclusion and economic grounds for past 25 years. Understand the Council share this aspiration and welcome this and future discussion opportunities. Development projects give opportunities to provide the very best of infrastructure for active travel to give real support and encouragement to the increasing numbers of citizens of all backgrounds who are taking up these active modes of travel. Hope the Council will take full advantage of these	<p>The Council shares the aspiration of the Highland Cycle Campaign that supports a shift from motorised vehicles to walking and cycling and also agrees that new developments must provide infrastructure to encourage active travel from the outset. This is reflected within the brief, whereby a key aim is to improve walking and cycling connections.</p> <p>It is agreed that some of the constraints are not necessarily constraints to active travel which could be accommodated. The opportunities map shows integrated areas for active travel/green network enhancement, many of which are within green space and close to water courses.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>changes to support modal shift.</p> <p>Constraints shown provide opportunities for active travel rather than affecting them adversely – active travel facilities fit well with green space, buffer zones and flood storage areas. Given flooding is periodic, it is likely that routes could be included at the edge of flood risk areas.</p> <p>Width of Culcabock Road near the Fluke is a recognised constraint. Disappointed that Culcabock Road has not been fully included.</p>	<p>The infrastructure constraints drawing shown in the issues and options paper was intended to illustrate physical constraints rather than traffic capacity/active travel constraints. The issue of the width of Culcabock Road near the Fluke roundabout is a detailed matter that will be considered further by the Council in progressing Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2. The length of Culcabock Road is not included within the development brief area or Inshes Junction Improvements because the proposals are seeking to reduce congestion and accommodate future development, primarily at the key congestion point at the Inshes Roundabout. This should however, result in knock on improvements to Culcabock Road, including active travel opportunities.</p>
<p><b>A Johnston</b></p>	<p>Concerned that 'proposed' road improvements ignore constraints illustrated to the east of Tesco car park. Questions if constraints illustrated are only a token gesture that is not considered in the design of development proposals.</p> <p>Area of flood risk illustrated limited – from experience a larger area has been prone to flooding; can provide details on request.</p> <p>Concerned that residential properties are shown to be areas of potential development. Requests respondents' residential property (Fearnbank) is shown as a constraint to road or commercial proposals.</p> <p>Notes that not all mature trees are represented.</p> <p>The safeguard for 'key gateway views over the city' has not been considered in the options presented.</p>	<p>The built and natural heritage constraints drawings illustrate a 20m buffer for all existing trees, including those to the east of the Tesco supermarket car park. The development guidelines in the issues and options paper indicate that there may be some impact on trees in these areas as a result of development. Potential tree impacts will be investigated when detailed designs are developed for Inshes Junction Improvements (including flood defences and attenuation). The development guidelines in the brief have been amended to make clear that there is likely to impacts on trees as a result of development, that the loss of trees should be minimised and compensatory planting may be required.</p> <p>The water and flood risk drawing illustrates the extent of surface water flooding shown in the SEPA flood maps. Fluvial flooding is excluded as this is not identified on the SEPA flood maps within the development brief area. This is due to the water courses within the brief area being of insufficient size to be recorded on SEPA's mapping. In the absence of evidence that illustrates the extent and frequency of flooding at this location, it is not appropriate for the development brief area to be mapped as a flood risk area. Although not mapped the presence of flood risk from the Dell Burn is acknowledged in the draft brief with an emerging solution to the flood risk being illustrated.</p> <p>Residential properties at Dell of Inshes are shown within 'white' areas on the 'all constraints' maps. The supporting text explains that 'white areas' may have potential for development. It is accepted that this drawing may be somewhat misleading shows some areas in white that do not have potential for development, for example existing properties and Raigmore Hospital car park. This drawing is not shown in the brief for these reasons. Rather, the opportunities drawing in the brief more clearly illustrates the location of development opportunities which excludes existing residential properties including Fearnbank. Furthermore, the brief's development guidelines for Dell of Inshes require the amenity of nearby residential properties to be protected.</p> <p>The built and natural heritage constraints to development drawing in the issues and options paper</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
		<p>illustrates a 20 metre buffer for mature trees. The location of mature trees was established by Council Forestry Officers plotting the location of trees during several site visits and using desk based methods. Without the representation stipulating the location/s where existing mature trees are not represented, it is not possible for any trees that may have been missed to be reviewed.</p> <p>The built and natural heritage constraints drawing and the development guidelines for the Dell of Inshes site contained in the issues and options paper illustrates and explains that key gateway views over the city must be safeguarded. Upon further consideration, given the prominent location of the site and views of it, particularly from the A9(T) northbound, development of the site at Dell of Inshes is likely alter this view to some extent, meaning it is unlikely the view can be fully safeguarded. As such the brief now requires the impact of development proposals on this view to be carefully assessed and for the site to be designed to minimise impact on this view wherever possible.</p>
<p><b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b></p>	<p>Constraints to development is a mixture of constraints, commentary on the constraints identified and specific issues that must be taken into account in any development. There are likely to be a range of alternatives and it is important for the brief to acknowledge that there are a variety of options available which would accord with principles set out in the development plan.</p> <p>Land safeguarded for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 encroaches onto land constrained for development – therefore conflicts with briefs overall intention of improving infrastructure. 'All constraints map' should acknowledge there are likely to be encroachments into areas of constraint to fulfil the wider intentions of the brief.</p> <p>Adjust constraints map to take account of the extant planning permission for retail warehousing at the southern section of the retail park – should not be constrained land. Discussions have taken place with planning officers regarding a new planning application on this site.</p>	<p>The brief sets out parameters and guidelines for development that allow for sufficient flexibility for the delivery of development in area that would accord with principles set out in the development plan.</p> <p>The outline proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 do encroach into areas identified as constraints on the 'all constraints' map in the issues and options paper. The encroachment areas are mainly areas of trees, areas at risk of surface water flooding and water course buffers. This drawing is not shown in the brief and the guidelines for development acknowledge that there may be environmental impacts associated with the proposals that are required to be minimised/mitigated. With regards to flooding and tree impacts, these will be investigated when detailed designs are developed for Inshes Junction Improvements (including flood defences and attenuation).</p> <p>With regards to the extant planning permission for non food retail development in the southern section of the retail park it is accepted that this should be acknowledged in the brief. As outlined above the constraints map is no longer shown in the brief, however, this site is referenced in the brief as a development opportunity, along with an explanation of the current planning permission and parameters for any alternative proposals should a new planning application be submitted.</p>
<p><b>Scottish Christian Party – Inverness Branch</b></p>	<p>Considers biggest constraint is Inshes overbridge for motorised traffic cyclists and pedestrians, agrees with plans to improve this.</p> <p>Most important to leave space on west of A9 for a strategic grade separated roundabout on the A9 similar to A9/A96 Connections Study</p>	<p>Noted. The majority of these comments are detailed transportation matters that will be considered further by the Council in progressing Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 and by Transport Scotland in progressing their A9/A96 Connections Study.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>Option A. Preference for A9/A96 Connections Option D but with roundabout amended to that shown in Option A. Considers roundabout is possibly too far south. Necessary to improve access to Inverness Campus from south, west and north. Suggested option will relive dangerous queuing on the A9 south carriageway at the B9006 slip road in long term; short time this can be relieved by upgrading the Inshes overbridge to three lanes. Must be considered urgently as Inverness Campus opens in autumn 2015.</p> <p>Further, the above still does not solve access problems for Inverness Campus once traffic has come off the A9 roundabout – still a tortuous route, ending up with a right hand turn into the campus.</p> <p>Note site is outwith brief area, on east side of A9, however support Westhill Community Council's suggestion that Inverness Campus should have dedicated 'front entrance' to the campus off the near-side lane of the A96/A9 slip road on to the south bound carriageway of the A9 before it reaches the main carriageway. Could be viewed as an enhancement of the brief and contribute to the Eastern Gateway experience of visitors arriving from the south on the A9.</p> <p>Above been extensively explained, with the rationale and advantages in previous submissions from Westhill Community Council. Fear it has not been understood and, worse still, misrepresented by senior personnel even within The Highland Council. Instead of the dangerous situation of queuing cars on the 70 mph southbound carriageway of the A9 at the B9006 sliproad, this proposal will contribute to road safety on the A9, local amenity and transport flexibility. The Scottish Christian Party supports the proposals already submitted by the Westhill Community Council for this additional access to the Campus.</p>	
<b>Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed improvements for walking and cycling? Are there any others?</b>		
<b>A Kidd</b>	<p>Does not agree with proposed improvements for walking and cycling. Considers the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• any new road layout and cycle and pedestrian facilities should, where possible separate cyclists and pedestrians</li> </ul>	<p>The Transport Scotland publication Cycling by Design advises that shared use paths should be considered after careful thought about controlling traffic volume, speed, junctions and crossings and carriageway space first. Often, due to existing constraints for example the presence of built development, it is not possible for segregated routes to be developed. The Council determines the appropriateness of shared or segregated routes taking into account all constraining factors.</p>



Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>from traffic to increase safety;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• proposals would increase conflict and reduce safety for cyclists and pedestrians, as it introduces a cross junction which would dramatically increase the likelihood of vehicular collisions – for example very serious T Bone Collisions, which would occur within meters of pedestrians and cyclists who would be very exposed due to standing next to junctions and traffic islands – increasing likelihood of death or serious injury for pedestrians and cyclists that is not as likely with a roundabout;</li> <li>• Golden bridge is badly positioned and not usable by general public - should be moved or a second less elaborate bridge provided next to the Inshes Overbridge, then would used by the public and students; would separate the cyclists and pedestrians from road traffic and allow the overbridge to be made a three full width carriageway which would this would help relieve congestion on the A9 southbound;</li> <li>• money being proposed on the Inshes Phase 2 project would be better spent on improving the existing Inshes roundabout and providing safer separation for cyclists and pedestrians, by using underpasses or bridges; and</li> <li>• suggests an innovative proposal similar version of the Dutch Floating Cycle bridges in Eindhoven and Enschede – Golden Bridge could be moved or second cycle bridge and be a fantastic iconic cycle/walking welcome to Inverness directly on the National Cycle Route 1 as it enters Inverness.</li> </ul>	<p>The outline proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements proposed to change the Inshes Roundabout into a four way traffic light controlled junction. Cycling by Design explains that whilst roundabouts may be safer for general traffic, this is not the case for cyclists where accident rates at roundabout are four times that for motor vehicles. Improving walking and cycling connections is part of the Council's transport policy and remains a key opportunity when steering future development in this area.</p> <p>The positioning of the Golden Bridge had already been the subject of much debate and its final position was decided upon based on a number of varying factors. Given the significant investment made to the bridge and that it is now in place and due to open in the near future there is no opportunity for it to be repositioned. In terms of a second bridge next to Inshes Overbridge, the outline proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements propose that the existing bridge is brought up to a three lane carriageway whilst still incorporating a route for pedestrians and cyclists. There would therefore be no requirement for a second bridge. The final decision on any upgrade of the Inshes Overbridge will be largely dependant upon the outcome of the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study, whereby Option D proposes to demolish and rebuild the bridge. Any rebuild could provide an opportunity for improvements to active travel facilities on the bridge.</p> <p>Other comments are detailed transportation matters that will be considered further in progressing detailed design for Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.</p>
<b>P Reynolds</b>	<p>A large proportion of the Highland population does not have access to a car, and another large proportion chooses to use bicycles as a means of travelling to work, saving millions in road construction and health bills. Paths should provide clearly marked and well-joined up direct shortest route access between new developments where there is no road access.</p>	<p>Noted, the Council shares these aspirations and the brief aims to provide an effective active travel network in the area.</p> <p>Concerns regarding limited active travel provision in Inverness are noted. Whilst East Inverness does lie outwith the brief area, it is important that effective connections from the brief area to East Inverness area are explored as part of the wider active travel network in Inverness. Responses to improvement</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>Concern regarding limited provision for pedestrian and cyclists in East Inverness and Raigmore, suggests issues/improvements listed below should be given consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct route from Golden Bridge to Stoneyfield Business Park, HIE, and the Inverness Retail Park - potential link across railway line near the Inverness Campus to too far to encourage residents of Raigmore Estate to walk to shops or large employers near the A9 - link by Howdens and route across the fence/ditches near HIE need to be opened up if possible – not expensive compared to Golden Bridge;</li> <li>• Lack of active travel connections between Raigmore Hospital Campus and Raigmore Estate – no defined pedestrian/cycle route, can be negotiated but lack of paved paths, unsuitable for people with pushchairs and wheelchairs. High fence surrounding Centre for Health Science blocks obvious pedestrian route along the front of the centre - important to create connection given new footbridge, bus interchange and availability of cycle parking at the hospital;</li> <li>• Not clear where well-made path between Centre for Health Science and Lifescan leads to – does not appear to key destinations, such as Raigmore Hospital; and</li> <li>• Requests clear signs in the following locations (1) at the new Footbridge and (2) at the other end of the Raigmore Community Centre and (3) at the Stone Circle – stating where paths do and do not lead to.</li> </ul>	<p>suggestions are provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regards a direct route from the Golden Bridge to I funding for a walking, cycling and public transport link has recently been awarded with this route anticipated to be progressed in the near future. An indication of the location of this link is shown as a 'committed new foot/cycle path' on the active travel map in the brief;</li> <li>• It is accepted that there are poor active travel connections between Raigmore Estate through the Raigmore Hospital Campus. This is acknowledged in the brief; improved active travel connections are illustrated on the map and contained in the action plan; and</li> <li>• Development of an effective path network in and around Raigmore Hospital Campus that is east to follow, useful and attractive is listed in the walking, cycling and public transport action plan contained in the brief.</li> </ul>
<b>D Morrison</b>	Agrees with proposed improvements for walking and cycling.	Noted.
<b>L Campbell</b>	Reminder that inclusion of landscaping improves air quality and amenity. Requests that it is ensured that 'through routes' are provided that link with other walking/cycling paths.	Noted, proposals for development opportunities in the area are required to incorporate landscaping as an integral part of schemes. The active travel map contained in the brief aims to provide an integrated active travel network that provides through routes to that link to the wider network. During

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
		the second phase of public consultation there will be an opportunity for any 'missing links' to be identified.
A Cox	Agrees with proposed improvements for walking and cycling but notes there can be difficulties with 'shared use' paths if cyclists do not behave in a respective manner, for example not using a bell or travelling past pedestrians at excessive speeds.	Noted.
S&J Pumford	Agrees with proposed improvements for walking and cycling.	Noted.
L Cload	<p>Supports proposed improvements next to Police Station, access across southern distributor road and access proposed through the Woodgrove Crescent SUDS pond and maintaining cycle access on road parallel to Old Perth Road.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossing has been missed at the rear of Inshes Retail Park, near Aldi – part of vital safe walking route between housing estate and retail park.</p> <p>Lack of crossing proposed at new Tesco roundabout.</p> <p>Following opportunities/issues should be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dedicated cycle lanes along the whole of Old Perth Road (not a painted line);</li> <li>• widen footway and make a shared use path rather than three traffic lanes proposed near the Shell garage as there is limited congestion at this point - many of the school children to Millburn use the footpath on this stretch to cycle and walk currently to bypass the dangerous fluke roundabout;</li> <li>• currently no good and safe cycle / pedestrian connection to Inverness retail park from Inshes / Raigmore - there are steps and dangerous road crossings on the route; and</li> <li>• pedestrian access across the A9 from the Balvonie Of Inshes Road to B9117 should be maintained and improved to provide alternative and interesting routes for pedestrians and runners.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, these walking/cycling improvement opportunities are continued to be recognised in the brief.</p> <p>The existing pedestrian crossing at the south end of the retail park between Aldi and the southern part of the retail park was omitted from the walking and cycling map shown in the issues and options paper in error. This crossing has now been added to the active travel map in the brief.</p> <p>The brief provides an indication of potential pedestrian/cycle crossing points, the exact location will be dependant on the detailed design of Inshes Junction Improvements. However, permeability of the proposed roundabout between the northern and southern parts for active travel is important, for this reason the roundabout is shown encircled by walking/cycling improvement opportunities.</p> <p>In terms of other opportunities/issues raised, these will be considered further as designs for Inshes Junction Improvements are progressed. Outwith the brief area improved links to the Inverness Retail and Business Park are being investigated.</p> <p>Pedestrian access across the A9 from the Balvonie Of Inshes Road to B9117 is part of the Inshes and Milton of Leys Development Brief which requires the Council monitor progress with that route as the area develops.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<b>C Dickinson</b>	Wants improvements to be made to National Cycle Network 1 in Inverness because this gives better and more varied options for entering the city. Lists existing issues as: contact with major supermarket access; Longman Industrial Estate the city centre – all means too many junctions that stop the natural flow of the cyclist. To increase cycling; introduce park and ride to reduce city centre traffic and reduce speed limit in city centre to 20 mph.	Opportunities to improve the National Cycle Network will be explored as part of Inshes Junction Improvements where the route lies within the project area. Outwith the area covered by Inshes Junction Improvements opportunities to improve the route may be explored through utilising active travel funding opportunities. Wider initiatives such as park and ride and speed limit reductions are being explored by the Council.
<b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b>	<p>Wants direct and safer walking/cycle route between Raigmore Estate/Millburn Road and Stoneyfield Business Park – no recognition given this potential, routes are currently via the Raigmore Interchange.</p> <p>Connections via Golden Bridge are limited – opportunity has been missed to link this with Stoneyfield and Inverness Retail and Business Park.</p> <p>Wants better at grade pedestrian/cycle/disabled connections across Perth Road between Drakies and Raigmore Hospital.</p>	<p>Whilst East Inverness does lie outwith the brief area, it is important that effective connections to East Inverness are maximised as part of the wider active travel network.</p> <p>The limitations of Raigmore Interchange to active travel are acknowledged. Funding has recently been awarded to provide a walking, cycling and public transport link between Inverness Retail Park and the new Inverness Campus which is anticipated to improve public transport and active travel connections.</p> <p>The potential for improved pedestrian/cycle/disabled connections between Drakies and Raigmore Hospital will be explored in detail as part of Inshes Junction Improvements.</p>
<b>M Campbell</b>	<p>Does not agree with proposed junction for Old Perth Road that blocks off access to the road next to the Raigmore Motel and ambulance turning because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased distance to travel to enter and exit Drakies estate for those living on the western edge of the estate; and</li> <li>• Safety issues associated with increased travelling time and journey distances for emergency services responding to incident on western parts of estate.</li> </ul>	These comments are more relevant to Inshes Junction Improvements and will be considered further as detailed designs progress for this project.
<b>B Hill</b>	<p>Considers there is not enough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secure, child safe crossings (not bumps but enforcement); and</li> <li>• Cycle safe surfaces (not over sunken drainage grids).</li> </ul>	These comments are more relevant to Inshes Junction Improvements and will be considered further as detailed designs progress for this project.
<b>D Donald</b>	<p>Agrees to a point with defined walking and cycling routes but can only be effective if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong road safety education delivered by road safety officers in nurseries, schools etc.; and</li> <li>• Strong enforcement of traffic legislation by police.</li> </ul>	Noted, road safety education is understood to be routinely delivered in schools and nurseries and the police enforce traffic legislation.

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	Currently too many cyclists in the area consider they are above the law putting themselves and other road users at risk.	
<b>S Paterson</b>	Agrees with proposed improvements for walking and cycling. Notes that Old Perth Road to Millburn Road needs improvements for cycling – in particular quality of surface and lack of designated cycle lane.	Noted. The section of Old Perth Road that connects to Millburn Road is outwith the brief and Inshes Junction Improvement area. However these suggestions may be explored as part of wider improvements to the active travel network.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	To ensure safety for cyclists and pedestrians cycle route should be separated from pedestrians and must be in addition to existing carriageways – not a painted line along existing roads.	The Transport Scotland publication Cycling by Design states that if a lot of cyclists and pedestrians (between 100-200 per hour) are likely to use the route at any one time segregation may be considered. The combined desirable minimum widths for a 2-way cycleway with a pedestrian only space beside it would be 5m wide or an absolute minimum of 3.5m. Fitting those widths into the existing or proposed layouts would reduce the capacity of the road network. The appropriateness of segregated paths is determined by the Council on a case by case basis, and is influenced by a number of factors, for example availability of space, traffic levels and resources available. This means it is not always possible for segregated paths to be provided.
<b>Goodson Associates (Acting on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited)</b>	Agrees with proposed improvements as these will be beneficial to the wider area.	Noted.
<b>I Stewart</b>	Query what is meant by active travel opportunity - questions if it is an internal service road for use by the Police.	An 'active travel' opportunity was illustrated in the development guidelines for the land south of Police Scotland in the issues and options paper. It was intended to show a potential walking/cycling route through the site as an improvement to the walking and cycling network in the area and not an internal service road for use by the Police. The development guidelines illustration in the brief has been amended to read 'safer, attractive, walking and cycling links between Inshes Retail Park and Old Perth Road' to make this clearer.
<b>J Shankland</b>	Suggested improvement route behind Police Scotland crossing over to Retail Park is longer than present route via pedestrian crossing at Inshes Roundabout for residents at the hospital end of the estate. Part of the estate at the other end of Drumossie Avenue is already served by a pedestrian route from East Mackenzie Park.	An informal route is apparent at this location, possibly because it is a more direct route into the retail park for employees at Police Scotland or because people are using Sir Walter Scott Drive rather than the retail park's internal roads and paths to access units at the northern end of the retail park. It is also a direct route to the crossing at Aldi. Given development is supported to the south of Police Scotland, this crossing point is likely to become more heavily used and formalisation of it would improve its safety. The walking, cycling and public transport action plan in the brief indicates that this link would be delivered either as part of the development of land south of Police Scotland or as part of Inshes Junction Improvements, this also applies to the remainder of this route.
<b>L Lee</b>	Supports any improvements to walking and cycling – considers this needs to be supported as much as possible for health and wellbeing as much as traffic reduction.	Noted, the Council shares this aspiration.

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<p><b>Highland Cycle Campaign</b></p>	<p>Considers improvements for walking and cycling are hard to discern, main goal appears to be improving flow for motorised traffic.</p> <p>The accompanying map exaggerates the existing shared use paths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only proposed route on Millburn Road and the existing path passing Lifescan are suitable for shared use;</li> <li>• Difficult to consider paths listed below as shared paths: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ west of Raigmore Interchange on the south side of Millburn Road is not signed as shared use;</li> <li>○ King Duncan's Road path is too steep and possibly too narrow;</li> <li>○ Paths in Raigmore Wood are narrow, steep or unsurfaced; and</li> <li>○ NCN Route 1 deteriorates steadily from the existing roundabout at Sir Walter Scott Drive to Culcabock Road.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>With regard to the various Cross Sections shown:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.5m Advisory Cycleways on both sides + 2.0m footway on both side [A-A, B-B];</li> <li>• 3.0m Footway/Cycleway on one side + 2.0m footway [E-E, D-D, C-C]; and</li> <li>• 2.5m Footway/Cycleway on one side [F-F].</li> </ul> <p>The 1.5m Advisory Cycleways are on-carriageway with-flow cycle lanes as described in CbyD 5.1.3. For these, the Desirable Minimum Width is 2.0m. A width of 1.5m is the Absolute Minimum and its disadvantages are clearly set out in the final paragraph. These problems, such as motor traffic passing cycles too closely, are frequently experienced on the existing advisory cycle lanes on Culcabock Road.</p> <p>The 3.0m Footway/Cycleway are off-carriageway shared cycleways (for cycles and pedestrians) as described in CbyD 6. Although this width conforms to the Desirable Minimum Width, many pedestrians don't feel safe on shared use cycleways and can themselves create conflicts with cyclists. HCC ask The Highland Council to consider a</p>	<p>The walking and cycling map shown in the issues and options paper described many of the paths in the area as shared use paths. Given that the majority of paths shown are Core Paths people have a right to walk and cycle on these routes provided they do so responsibly. Access along them is shared. However the Council recognises that there is a difference between what may be desirable to promote as a shared use route for active travel and what might be cycled.</p> <p>The remainder of the comments are more relevant to Inshes Junction Improvements and will be considered further as detailed design is undertaken for this project.</p> <p>Comments regarding barriers to active travel at the Raigmore Interchange are noted and the Council acknowledges there are issues with this part of the active. Opportunities to improvements may be explored in detail by the Council and Transport Scotland in the future, dependant upon resources available.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>pedestrian pavement and a two-way cycles only 2.0m (or 3.0m) cycleway.</p> <p>2.5m Footway/Cycleway on one side is too narrow but is constrained by the width of the bridge. The solution here would be to remove a lane of motorised traffic or widen the bridge.</p> <p>Crossings at junctions appear to give priority to maintaining traffic flow. A pedestrian/cyclist may need to cross a junction in up to four stages (that is wait for signals up to four times). Cyclists are required to negotiate, alongside pedestrians, right-angled turns and chicanes. This is very poor and particularly awkward or even impossible for tandems, tricycles, bicycles with trailers/panniers. This will result in cyclists joining the road traffic which in turn will annoy drivers and be less safe. Whereas a width of 2.5m or 3.0m might be considered adequate for shared use cycleways this width in chicanes at crossings will only cause conflict. (It can only be navigated inconveniently but safely by a single bicycle.) Pedestrians and cyclists need to be separated completely at crossings, with cyclists closer to the junction and taking a more direct route.</p> <p>Questions whether route on the south side of Millburn road and crossing the south ramps of the A9 at Raigmore Interchange is a shared use route, suggest following improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• brought up to appropriate standard as it is a major route for employees of the retail parks;</li> <li>• essential that the crossing of the southbound on ramp be signalised by a Toucan crossing - absence of this is the major barrier to cycle commuting in Inverness - Council must engage with Transport Scotland so that this can be installed at the earliest opportunity;</li> <li>• steps connecting from Raigmore Interchange to Raigmore Estate provide a very popular route but are badly in need of renovation. Suggests considering conversion of part of the width</li> </ul>	

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	to a slope for the benefit of cycles and prams – similar to subway at the end of Innes Street to Longman Road.	
<b>A Johnston</b>	Wishes consideration of pedestrian/cycle underpass to access bus stops on B9006 to north of Tesco.	This is a plausible suggestion, particularly because the pedestrian crossing is regularly used and also impacts on traffic flow in the area. This suggestion will be explored further as detail design for Inshes Junction Improvements are progressed.
<b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b>	This section should acknowledge that alternative walking and cycling options could be developed upon final development scenarios, particularly as the brief is proposing transportation improvements which will mean that existing walking and cycling routes will change and desire links will also be created which do not currently exist.	It is agreed, given final development and infrastructure proposals are currently unknown, that alternative walking and cycling routes than those presented in the active travel map may be more appropriate. This is acknowledged in the brief. The routes shown on the map do however provide an indication of the scale of active travel improvements that development is expected to deliver.
<b>Question 3: What improvements to public transport would you like to see in the area?</b>		
<b>A Kidd</b>	No improvements required.	Noted.
<b>J Melling</b>	Wishes all bus routes with the exception of Drakies services to serve both Raigmore Hospital Campus and the University.	Several services already serve Raigmore Hospital and following the opening of the Inverness Campus in 2015 it will also be served by several bus services. The potential for an increased number of existing services to serve Raigmore and the Inverness Campus will be discussed with Council Public Transport Officer's and bus providers.
<b>Anonymous</b>	Questions if a bus link between Raigmore Housing Estate and Raigmore Hospital has been considered. Suggests bus gates could be used.	A condition was attached to the Inverness Campus planning permission that stipulated a bus link (using bus gates) should be provided between Raigmore Estate and Raigmore Hospital at the time of the opening of the new Inverness Campus. However, there were a number of issues relating to the delivery of this, including safety issues associated with the heli-pad at Raigmore Hospital and viability issues in providing the service from the part of bus operators. As such the Council agreed that the delivery of this requirement would be reviewed once a certain proportion of the Inverness Campus is complete or within a specified time period of the campus opening. Given this requirement has now been delayed it would not be appropriate for it to be shown in the brief.
<b>L Campbell</b>	<p>Be consistent with signage; reduce/remove unnecessary signage, this also applies to roads.</p> <p>Ensure, where possible, late bus services co-ordinating with shift work patterns.</p> <p>Where possible, simple accessible bus shelters appropriate to character of area.</p> <p>Keep on the agenda possibility of re-siting the bus station (in spite of lease) and allowing some more landscaping even trees in tubs in city</p>	These general comments regarding public transport services and infrastructure are noted and will be considered further by the Council's Public Transport Officer.



Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	areas to improve air quality.	
A Cox	Suggests new bus shelter on Drumossie Avenue adjacent to the 'green' (approximately opposite number 49).	Noted, however no justification is provided for this suggestion. Any requirement for new or relocated bus shelters in the area will be considered by the Council's Public Transport Officer's and as part of the detailed design for Inshes Junction Improvements.
Inverness South Community Council	Supports improvements shown.	Noted.
L Clod	Useful for a bus service between Inshes and Inverness Airport and Inverness Retail Park.	Noted, it is acknowledged that there is currently limited services between Inshes and East Inverness. The opening of the Inverness Campus and future public transport link between Inverness Retail Park and the Campus may provide an opportunity for services to be delivered in the future. The potential for this will be discussed with Council Public Transport Officer's and bus providers.
D & Whillis	Wants better bus links in Inshes area.	Noted, the brief illustrates potential public transport improvements by illustrating routes through Inshes Retail Park.
C Dickinson	Introduce park and ride; bus and taxi lanes in key city areas; open new train station at Inverness Campus and Inverness Airport.	These comments relate to wider initiatives that do not directly relate the brief area. The initiatives are however currently being explored by the Council and other private and public sector organisations.
GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd	Wishes bus service to Stoneyfield Business Park because developers provided bus infrastructure as part of development proposals which after ten years remains unused.	Noted, Stoneyfield Business Park lies outwith the brief area. The funding that has recently been awarded for a walking, cycling and public transport link between Inverness Retail Park and the Inverness Campus may provide an opportunity for public transport to also service Stoneyfield Business Park in the future.
B Hill	Considers public transport is good and has wide coverage. Suggests that to increase passengers fares should be reduced.	Noted. It is outwith the scope of the brief to influence bus fares.
D Donald	Would like to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cleaner and better standard of buses; and</li> <li>• routes that the travelling public want, not what is only profitable to the bus company.</li> </ul>	Noted. It is outwith the scope of the brief to influence the cleanliness and standard of buses. For certain developments that Council can require a subsidised bus service is provided by the developer for a period of time.
Westhill Community Council	Considers that bus gate on Millburn Road is likely to increase congestion problems, particularly at peak times.  Suggests that construction of an additional entrance to Inverness Campus via a dedicated lane (from Raigmore Interchange sliproad to A9 south - as suggested by Westhill CC) would enable a new bus route through the Campus to be created - particularly beneficial to students since proposed student accommodation is in city centre.	The bus gate on Millburn Road is required as part of the planning permission for Inverness Campus to help reduce public transport journey times. Any impact on congestion following the opening of the campus will be closely monitored.  The construction of Inverness Campus is at an advanced stage, this, in addition to technical limitations, is likely to inhibit the potential for the delivery of an additional entrance to the Campus.

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<b>Goodson Associates (Acting on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited)</b>	Supports increased services to/from Inshes Retail Park.	Noted – no bus services currently run through the retail park. The brief suggests a potential bus route through the retail park. Should this route be confirmed in the finalised brief the frequency of services will be considered in detail in consultation with bus operators and Council Public Transport Officers.
<b>I Stewart</b>	Suggests that the Council request bus companies to provide bus timetables at all bus stops.	Noted. It is outwith the scope of the brief to influence the level of information which is displayed at bus shelters.
<b>J Shankland</b>	Requests that issues associated with buses serving Drakies Estate via Drumossie Avenue/Manson Road, in particular tight bends and parked vehicles are looked at.	Noted. This matter will be brought to the attention of the Council's Public Transport Officers.
<b>L Lee</b>	<p>No buses from Briargrove into town – 20 minute walk to bus shelters on B9006, which are often full – discourages people from using public transport particularly during adverse weather conditions in winter.</p> <p>Frequent, subsidised bus routes are a sensible way of reducing traffic.</p> <p>Park and ride, in combination with bus priority lanes meaning it is faster to travel to bus, would also help reduce traffic.</p>	<p>The brief acknowledges the lack of bus services within Inshes Retail Park, this also applies to the housing development at Briargrove directly east of Inshes Retail Pak. The brief suggests a new bus route through Inshes Retail Park – this route would also be of benefit to residents of Briargrove.</p> <p>Suggestions for improving public transport to reduce traffic are noted.</p>
<b>A Johnston</b>	Proposed "new/changed" bus route through the Inshes retail park would assist reduce pedestrians having to cross the B9006.	Noted.
<b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b>	Buses do not currently utilise the defined route through Inshes Retail Park and with improvements already undertaken within the park and further improvements planned, the suitability of maintaining a public transport route through the retail park is questionable. A more appropriate route could be to the east of Inshes Church on existing public roads. However, the brief should maintain flexibility to allow public transport provision to evolve as new development is created.	<p>The lack of public transport provision within Inshes Retail Park encourages visitors to travel there by car. The existing retail park is a significant travel-generating use, and additional travel will be generated as a result of its further development. Therefore, in line with Scottish Planning Policy, it must be well served by public transport and supported by measures to promote the availability of high-quality public transport services. It is therefore considered that the delivery of a public transport route through Inshes Retail Park is essential to the sustainable growth of the retail park and should be maintained in the brief.</p> <p>The suggested route shown in the issues and options paper was considered most appropriate given it would link to existing public transport infrastructure within the retail park. However it is acknowledged that, dependant on the outcome of Inshes Junction Improvements and the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study amongst other factors, it may be more appropriate for a route to run along the east of Inshes Church. Both routes are illustrated in the brief and will be subject to further consultation with relevant parties.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
		The timing of public transport provision is dependent on the mechanism for its delivery, ideally to reflect the timing of the opening of new development. These issues will be considered further following the briefs public consultation.
<b>Q4: Do you agree with our guidelines for development?</b>		
J Melling	Agrees for this area of the town. Disagrees in relation to southern distributor road where a strategic agreement has been severely compromised over last 30 years.	Noted.
D Morrison	Supports guidelines for development.	Noted.
L Campbell	<p>Encouraging that environmental needs are considered at planning stage.</p> <p>Air quality and holistic benefits of trees /shrubs increasingly important for now and future generations. Consider the enduring appeal of the islands' trees and landscaping/walkways.</p> <p>Remember to increase drainage capacity.</p> <p>Please remember to be inclusive.</p>	Noted. Requirements for landscaping and active travel opportunities are specified in the brief as integral elements to the design of new development.
A Cox	Considers guidelines seem reasonable and of benefit to the community.	Noted.
Inverness South Community Council	Supports guidelines for development.	Noted.
L Cload	<p>Considers brownfield site of former Blockbuster and land directly north should be developed prior to greenfield sites at Dell of Inshes and south of Police HQ.</p> <p>Walking routes from Woodgrove Drive housing estate to the retail park and the amenities should be taken into account, with safe crossing provided.</p> <p>Supports protection of green edge and trees and access through the green edge</p>	The site of the former video rental store, an existing restaurant and adjacent vacant land within a southern portion of the retail park are now addressed in the brief. The site was not referred to within the issues and options paper mainly because it had an existing planning permission and was therefore limited opportunity for debate on the development of the site. However, given the wider public may not be aware of the extant planning permission and that the applicant has indicated to the Council that a new planning application may be submitted for the site it was felt beneficial for the site to be included within the brief. Furthermore, it is agreed that the existing retail park should be completed prior to the development of Dell of Inshes, which is intended to form an extension to the retail park. This is a requirement of the brief. However it is not appropriate to stipulate a requirement for the site south of Police Scotland to be developed after completion of the existing retail park as different uses are proposed.

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
		The active travel map includes an option for a new pedestrian/cycle crossing at Woodgrove Drive housing estate. Any requirement for this may be dependant upon changes to traffic levels as a result of the outcome of Inshes Junction Improvements/Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study.
D&J Whillis	Supports guidelines for development.	Noted.
C Dickinson	Supports improved cycle access to area. Already cycles to area, notes that Tesco cycle parking is always full.	Noted. Provision of bicycle stands will be required to be delivered in line with the Council Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Development.
Scottish Natural Heritage	<p><i>Dell of Inshes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports maintenance and enhancement of Dell Burn habitat corridor including mature trees;</li> <li>• Recommends that a criteria for the design of the flood attenuation area should be to enhance local biodiversity because it had significant potential to be of greenspace and habitat value;</li> <li>• Welcomes trees being retained but seeks clarification that the tree belt nearest to the Dell Burn is also being retained;</li> <li>• Supports further landscaping to augment the existing tree lines by deeping the habitat corridor and compensate for any loss of mature trees as a result of the east-west transport connections;</li> <li>• Recommend badger survey is required given extent of badger activity around the south and east fringes of Inverness; and</li> <li>• Recommend bat survey for any mature trees that need to be felled.</li> </ul> <p><i>South of Police Scotland</i></p> <p>Welcomes: recognition of the local watercourse/tree belt feature to the south of the existing building; proposed requirement that tree loss should be minimised and wildlife habitat improved and requirement for additional landscaping to tie in with this along the southern and eastern sides as this will assist with the setting of development, and soften the landscape impact approaching from the south west.</p>	<p>Support comments for both the Dell of Inshes and Land South of Police Scotland are noted and these elements have been carried forward to the brief.</p> <p>The brief now identifies active travel/green network improvement opportunities, including the area around the proposed flood attenuation pond. The design guidelines for Dell of Inshes illustrate a requirement for 'green and habitat network enhancement' which is described in the annotation as visually attractive landscaping and improved wildlife habitats that minimise/compensate for any loss of existing mature trees. With regards to the retention of the trees this is dependant upon the final design for the flood attenuation pond. Detailed design of the flood scheme will be informed by comprehensive tree survey and impact assessment which will aim to deliver the scheme in line with the Highland-wide Local Development Plan policies relating to trees and development.</p> <p>The brief includes a requirement for species surveys including badgers and bats for any mature trees that need to be felled.</p>
GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd	Does not agree with guidelines for development.  Requests:	A tree belt runs parallel to the burn which forms the northern boundary of the Land South of Police Scotland site. The guidelines for development within the issues and options paper illustrated that access to the site could potentially be taken from north and over the burn and trees. The revised guidelines for development contained in the brief now acknowledge that this new access may have an

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explanation of how the loss of existing trees can be minimised to the south of Police Scotland; and</li> <li>• justification for the grossly enlarged roundabout to the south east of Tesco Inshes - concerned that pedestrian/cycle links between the Woodgrove housing area and the retail park will be severely compromised by this roundabout, which as existing is a significant barrier to non vehicle use.</li> </ul>	<p>impact on the trees at this location and that their loss must be minimised. It is expected that if access to the site was provided at this point it would result in the loss of a number of trees, but that much of tree belt at this location would remain. Furthermore the revised guidelines also specify that new landscaping should be provided.</p> <p>The roundabout shown to the south east of Tesco at Inshes is indicative. The actual size of the roundabout will be dependant upon future predicted traffic flows which will be influenced by a number of factors, including the outcome of the Inshes Junction Improvements and the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study. Active travel, in particular between the Woodgrove housing area and the retail park, will be an important consideration in the detailed design of the roundabout. The active travel map in the brief already indicates potential connections in this area.</p>
<b>B Hill</b>	<p>Considers that infrastructure should be in place before development.</p> <p>All the proposals have merit and if possible choose those that will be compatible with eventual A82/A9/A96 connection.</p>	<p>The timing of infrastructure provision will be linked to the timing of the delivery of development.</p> <p>Comments relating to an A82/A9/A96 connection are more relevant to Transport Scotland's A9/A96 Connections Study and have been passed to Transport Scotland for their consideration.</p>
<b>Graham and Sibbald (Acting on behalf on Mr &amp; Mr Grant)</b>	<p>Supports aim to 'enable business expansion, create employment opportunities and developer safer walking and cycling routes to Inshes District Centre' – however site boundary shown in brief is overly restrictive to allow aims to be achieved.</p> <p>Extension of site has been promoted through the emerging Inner Moray Firth Development Local Plan process. At the Main Issues Report consultation stage, the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recognised that the open space in this location provides no amenity value;</li> <li>• saw the site as being commercially viable; and</li> <li>• raised concerns in relation to the capacity of the local roads network to support additional business space at this location – these will be addressed by the proposed junction improvement currently being consulted on.</li> </ul> <p>Suggests that the site boundary is extended to the roundabout at the entrance to Inshes Retail Park and that the site as a whole is allocated for business use because:</p>	<p>The boundary of the development brief at this location reflects the boundary shown in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan and the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan. The Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan is currently being examined by Scottish Ministers who will make a recommendation regarding all outstanding representations, including the request for the site to the south of Police Scotland to be extended. It would be inappropriate for the site boundary to be extended in the brief before the outcome of the examination is known. It is expected that the examination will be concluded in early 2015. The brief includes a statement that should the outcome of the examination result in any significant changes the sites within the brief area then the brief will be revised to reflect this at an early opportunity. Therefore, should any recommendation be made in the report of examination for the site to be enlarged, the brief would be reviewed at an early opportunity to reflect this.</p> <p>It is agreed that should Police Scotland provide any confirmation that the site is no longer required for the expansion of Police Scotland then the site would be available for wider business use.</p> <p>The outline proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements show a new access to Police Scotland directly north of the Police Scotland building as a result of closing off this leg of the Inshes Roundabout. An alternative to this access is also shown running through the land to South of Police Scotland site. If access were to be taken to the south of the building this would reduce the area of developable land at land of the south of Police Scotland. The access point to the site is dependant upon the outcome of Inshes Junction Improvements and its end user – i.e Police Scotland or private business use development. The development brief has been written on the basis that the new access</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the extension to the site boundary will provide sufficient land to enable business expansion and create employment opportunities; and</li> <li>• will also ensure that this site is developed in accordance with the principles of the Development Framework.</li> </ul> <p>Support allocation of site for expansion of Police Scotland, however allocation has been made for sometime without proposals coming forward. Therefore request allocation provides flexibility for general business use should Police Scotland not progress with their expansion plans.</p> <p>Potential new vehicle access for Police Scotland - request that the Development Brief provides flexibility should the Police Headquarters not progress and the additional access is no longer required.</p> <p>Guidelines for development - supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creation of walking and cycling links;</li> <li>• proposed link between this site and the Inshes Retail Park; and</li> <li>• agree existing building line should be maintained and any new development should complement existing building position and massing.</li> </ul>	<p>to Police Scotland will be taken from the north of existing building, and therefore does not make provision for an alternative access to the rear. Should the outcome of Inshes Junction Improvement stipulate the access should be taken from rear then the brief would be reviewed at an early opportunity.</p> <p>Comments supporting the design guidelines are noted and the same principles have been carried forward to the brief.</p>
<b>D Donald</b>	<p>Does not agree guidelines for development. Land reserved for improved road lines have previously been ignored – resulting in problems we are having on the roads.</p> <p>Guidelines should consider that is practical before what is attractive. Areas of unoccupied land should first be considered for low-cost residential use rather than office developments. Considers too many existing office developments are slotted into unoccupied land have limited parking.</p>	<p>The brief stipulates that land required for Inshes Junction Improvements as shown on the outline proposals drawings and any subsequent iterations must be safeguarded from development. Once the brief is adopted following consultation this requirement must be adhered to unless justifiable material considerations indicate otherwise. With regard to the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study because this study is at an options stage Transport Scotland cannot stipulate that the land must be safeguarded at this stage. However the brief required that development proposals do consider the alignment of options.</p> <p>The brief aims to promote development in the area that is viable and attractive. The Council and other social housing providers are actively perusing low cost housing developments on a range of sites in Highland. The development sites contained within the brief are not considered suitable for low cost housing at this time. In terms of parking, developments within brief area are required to provide parking consistent with the Council's Road Guidelines for New Development.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<b>S Paterson</b>	Agrees with development guidelines but would like to see former Blockbuster Video store and vacant land opposite developed. Vacant land has been this way since the business park was developed and is a blight on the area.	The site of the former video rental store, an existing restaurant and adjacent vacant land within a southern portion of the retail park are now addressed in the brief. The site was not referred to within the issues and options paper mainly because it had an existing planning permission and was therefore limited opportunity for debate on the development of the site. However, given the wider public may not be aware of the extant planning permission and that the applicant has indicated to the Council that a new planning application may be submitted for the site it is considered beneficial for the site to be included within the brief. Furthermore, the brief requires that this site should be developed prior to the development of the Dell of Inshes which is intended to be an extension to the retail park. This gives priority to the development of the existing retail park, and therefore improving the amenity of this area.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	Suggests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of underpasses and pedestrian/cycle bridges where possible to minimise increasing traffic congestion due to pedestrian crossing; and</li> <li>• Vehicular access to Police Scotland should be further away from Inshes Roundabout as traffic is frequently backed-up at this location.</li> </ul>	Noted – these comments are more relevant to Inshes Junction Improvements and will be considered further in the progression of this project.
<b>I Stewart</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inset maps/diagrams are too small to be fully interpreted.</li> <li>• Walking times shown in walking distances diagram seem less than in reality, for example diagram suggests 10 minutes walking time from Dell of Inshes to Culcabock Junction.</li> <li>• Dell of Inshes site occupies a pivotal location with excellent links to the A9, A96 and potentially A82 – would lend itself to a more prestigious use such as a civic purpose, even relocation of the Local Authority HQ and gaining symmetry through proximity with Police HQ; Hospital and Beechwood Business Park.</li> </ul>	<p>It is agreed that the size of a number of drawings contained in the issues and options paper may be too small to be meaningfully interpreted. Where appropriate larger drawings have been provided in the brief.</p> <p>The walking distances diagram shown on the Dell of Inshes development guidelines in the issues and options paper was intended to be indicative and may not accurately represent actual walking times. This is likely to be due to non direct routes and potential delays at, for example, pedestrian crossings. This drawing has not been included within the brief. It is a rule of thumb intended to illustrate, in very broad terms, a notional walking time taken for residents within this catchment to reach facilities at Dell of Inshes. It provided a useful tool at the issues and options stage but has been omitted from the brief.</p> <p>The mix of uses proposed in the brief does not include business use as suggested by the respondent. This is because business use is not considered an appropriate use within an expanded district centre at Inshes. It is intended that the district centre should provide a range of shops and services for local communities.</p>
<b>J Shankland</b>	Unsure, suggests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• more public green spaces; and</li> <li>• new developments should have adequately sized parking spaces – currently many are small cars resulting in many vehicles using</li> </ul>	The brief identifies an active travel/green network enhancement opportunities diagram where green space should be retained. The guidelines for the Dell of Inshes site require that attractive landscaping is provided that enhances quality green space.

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	two or more spaces.	Parking spaces are required to be provided in line with the Council's Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Development.
<b>F&amp;T McWilliam</b>	<p>Considers that future retail development at Dell of Inshes (refers to current planning application for retail development) will result in increased congestion and cannot be justified.</p> <p>Notes that a planning officer at the Council in relation to garden ground at 2 Dell of Inshes stated: 'It is recognised that this is garden ground however, the green wedges are important to the setting and character of the city and it would not be appropriate to allow their continued erosion.' Any proposal therefore to expand this roundabout and support a link road to the A9 that directly impacts on this land at Dell of Inshes is in direct contradiction to this position.</p>	<p>It is accepted that development of the site at Dell of Inshes will result in an increased number of vehicles in the area. The Council considers that the existing Inshes Roundabout is at capacity and in its current form cannot accommodate a significant amount of additional traffic. As such the brief requires that for the Dell of Inshes site to proceed it must be accessed from a new junction on Culloden Road.</p> <p>The alignment of two sections of route options C and D of the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study pass through garden ground associated with 2 Dell of Inshes. A recent pre-application enquiry for the erection of a house in garden ground at 2 Dell of Inshes was not supported by the Council because the site lies within an area defined as a green wedge in the Inverness Local Plan (as continued in force). The policy for this designation explains that there is a presumption against development likely to prejudice the intended purpose and function of these defined areas, as such the proposal for a house at this location was not supported. The Council views the proposal for a strategic road connection at this location differently from a single house proposal as the road has strategic importance for the future development of the city. A single house is not of strategic importance, particularly given that the development plan allocates a generous supply of housing land in the Inverness Housing Market Area. It is also worth noting that the emerging development plan, the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan, is at an advanced stage whereby the Proposed Plan is currently being examined by Scottish Ministers. Green wedge allocations are not proposed to be contained in the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan. Rather, the residential properties at Dell of Inshes are proposed to lie within 'white land' within the settlement development area, meaning there is a presumption in favour of development subject to detailed requirements. The report of examination which will make recommendations on the content of the development plan is anticipated to be available to the Council in early 2015. The plan will be adopted as soon as practically possible thereafter.</p>
<b>Highland Cycle Campaign</b>	<p>Photographs shown are clearly only intended to be indicative – would appreciate opportunity to make comment once more detailed plans have been drawn up.</p> <p>Ideas promoted are all individually desirable but conflicts can arise when taken together. For example, parking for cycles is often unsuitable by being poorly designed or badly positioned. Spill-out space can interfere with cycle paths.</p>	<p>Photographs shown in the issues and options paper were shown for indicative purposes. Further detail on the Council's requirements for the Dell of Inshes site is provided in the brief which will be subject to public consultation.</p> <p>Potential conflicts are noted and will be considered during detailed design of the site.</p>



Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<p><b>A Johnston</b></p>	<p>States guidelines appear to solely cater for site IN55 on the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan which is still in preparation. Requirements for site in this plan state: 'council to "produce a masterplan / development brief which it will adopt as supplementary guidance. This will address the need for completion of an / or land safeguards for, improvements to the trunk road and local road networks prior to development. Land safeguard for drainage improvements / safeguards; flood risk assessment (may affect developable area); transport assessment.'</p> <p>Notes that no flood risk assessment has been provided and that there is a requirement to engage SEPA and prepare a strategic flood risk assessment in accordance with their guidance LUPS-GU11v5 titled "Land Use Planning System". No evidence of the necessary early engagement to define flood risk, prepare a strategic flood risk assessment nor identify any required mitigation measures noting the first step is flood avoidance and then finally establish the principles of development.</p> <p>Notes that no transport assessment has been provided other than road layout options along the B9006 (see comments below to Transport Scotland regarding the apparent failings of the transport modelling).</p> <p>The absence of a flood risk assessment and transport assessment combined with the absence of consideration of the previously identified constraints the developable land boundary cannot be determined. Therefore the identified guidelines are nugatory at this time and brief booklet is premature as it is incomplete and does not provide the reader a complete view and understanding of all the issues.</p> <p>Notes that the two views purporting to represent safeguarding key views of the site from the A9 and Inshes overbridge appear to include a developers proposal. It is also noted that the guidelines state that the "development to accommodate proposed road realignment and flood scheme". As these factors are undefined the guideline is</p>	<p>The policy 'hook' for the development brief to be prepared as supplementary guidance is contained in the current adopted development plan, this being the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. The brief has been developed around the principles described in Policy 7 of this document which are also provided in the introductory section to the brief and not the emerging Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan is at an advanced stage whereby the Proposed Plan is currently being examined by Scottish Ministers. The outcome of the examination is expected to be known in early 2015. Once adopted the Inner Moray Firth Local Development Plan will provide an up to date planning police framework for the area; however until this time the Highland-wide Local Development Plan remains the extant development plan for the area. With regards to comments raised regarding incompatibility of the brief and the requirements listed in the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan the requirements listed are relevant to both a developer of the site and the Council. The reference to a requirement for a flood risk assessment and transport assessment is for a developer to undertake to support any future planning application on the site, rather than the Council at development brief stage.</p> <p>The Council has been working with SEPA in the preparation of the brief – both informally prior to the publication of the issues and options paper and a response from SEPA was received to the issues and options paper. A summary of the comments received from SEPA is provided in this report along with the Council's response to it.</p> <p>The road layout options provided as part of the Council's Inshes Junction Improvements have been informed by transport modelling undertaken by the Council.</p> <p>Therefore, given the developer is expected to produce a flood risk assessment and transport assessment the brief is not considered premature in these respects.</p> <p>Images containing key views do not illustrate developer proposals but instead highlight the extent of the Dell of Inshes site in a contrasting colour. Whilst detailed design of Inshes Junction Improvements is yet to be undertaken the brief requires that the extent of land safeguarded should reflect land contained identified in the outline proposals drawings and any subsequent iterations, this aspect is therefore defined in the brief.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>pointless.</p> <p>Should be a guideline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to reinforce the safeguards identified in the IMFLDP IN55 requirements; and</li> <li>• a safeguard to enforce all the key constraints identified in the development brief booklet and any others proposed and considered relevant.</li> </ul> <p>Once these are defined and a flood risk assessment and a transport assessment is undertaken the site boundary for the Dell of Inshes land uses can be determined and only then can guideline to confirmed.</p>	
<p><b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b></p>	<p>SWIPPT own land at Dell of Inshes and currently have a planning permission in principle pending on the site. Detailed discussions have been ongoing with Council officers regarding form and content of development proposed.</p> <p>Main concern is the suggestion for commercial uses to be accommodated in formal frontage parallel to the road in small commercial units with parking to the rear. This restriction on development is not supported because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not commercially viable as demand in area is for larger units set behind surface car parking – this form has been accepted elsewhere in the retail park and neighbourhood centre, in including land recently developed Aldi;</li> <li>• car park to rear means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ customers have to walk around the rear of units and service areas</li> <li>○ disabled parking is not then in accessible locations at the front of shops</li> <li>○ security risks out of hours given lack of natural surveillance from shop fronts</li> </ul> </li> <li>• no existing building line; and</li> <li>• over riding need is to ensure that there is viable development well related to the remainder of the centre.</li> </ul>	<p>Concerns regarding the proposal in the guidelines for development for commercial uses to be accommodated in a formal frontage with parking to rear are noted. It is accepted that this format of development may not be viable for a number of the reasons suggested, particularly issues associated with parking to rear of buildings. In response, the revised development guidelines illustrated in the brief no longer refer to a formal frontage or car park location and instead promote key principles for built form such as the requirement to minimise negative impact on key views, ensure active ground floors with generous spill-out space, and feature appropriate landscaping, trees, pavements and lighting to ensure safe, attractive circulation space for walking and cycling.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<b>Question 5: Do you have any other comments on the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief – Issues and Options?</b>		
<b>A Kidd</b>	<p>Considers brief should also mention the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• need to improve existing traffic flow and projected increased traffic flow at the Inshes Roundabout with the completion of the SDR link onto the A82 at Torvean; and</li> <li>• need to improve safety by reducing the stacking on the A9 southbound, particularly with the increased pressure the opening of the UHI access is going to cause at Inshes Junction and Inshes Roundabout.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council and/or Transport Scotland may undertake additional traffic modelling work to further assess future traffic flows in the city as a result of development and infrastructure proposals, including completion of the West Link. This work will be undertaken as part of the Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 project.</p> <p>The Council recognises the issues associated with traffic queuing on the A9 off-slip that connects to Culloden Road. The Council is working with Transport Scotland in developing transport network improvements that aim to reduce congestion in the area.</p>
<b>D Morrison</b>	<p>Agrees with proposed option at Inshes Overbridge; this requires to be addressed.</p>	<p>This comment relates to detailed transportation matters that will be considered further by the Council in progressing Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 and Transport Scotland in advancing the A9/A96 Connections Study.</p>
<b>L Campbell</b>	<p>Simplify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide safe pedestrian crossing points;</li> <li>• Roadside parking on side roads;</li> <li>• Minimise increase in traffic lights, where necessary at cross-roads provide slipways on left; and</li> <li>• Use roundabouts for landscaping/trees.</li> </ul>	<p>This comment largely relates to detailed transportation matters that will be considered further by the Council in progressing Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2.</p>
<b>A Cox</b>	<p>Particularly likes idea of allotments because allow for creative healing and foster a sense of community.</p>	<p>Noted, the brief requires that allotments are provided as part of the development mix of uses supported at Dell of Inshes.</p>
<b>Inverness South Community Council</b>	<p>Supports Inshes Junction Improvements Outline Proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fluke roundabout, ambulance junction and Tesco;</li> <li>• Content with new arrangement proposed at Drakies but questions whether another vehicle access could be provided from the roundabout at the southern end of Inshes Retail Park on Sir Walter Scott drive to a cul-de-sac off Drakies Avenue;</li> <li>• Content with Inshes roundabout proposals but considers a new access to Police Scotland may be better from the rear of the building;</li> <li>• Supports proposal for increased number of lanes on Inshes overbridge, requests this is delivered as soon as possible rather than waiting for the outcome of the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study. Notes alternative proposal may be required at a later date;</li> <li>• Entrance to the campus and roads - despite recent upgrades traffic still backs onto A9, this will be worse when Inverness</li> </ul>	<p>Many of these comments are most relevant to the Inshes Junction Improvements and Transport Scotland's A9/A96 Connections Study and will be considered by the Council and Transport Scotland as these projects progress.</p> <p>The request for the retention of trees are noted – any impact on trees as a result of the project must be consistent with Highland-wide Local Development Plan policies on trees and development and associated supplementary guidance. Furthermore the design guidelines in the brief require minimal tree loss and where necessary compensatory planting.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>Campus opens. Suggests additional entrances/exits to campus at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ entrance only from A9 South through existing lay-by; and</li> <li>○ entrance and exit from A9/A96 proposed new link.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Considers drainage/flooding on Inshes Retail Park should be left to the experts but needs addressing in the area. Questions where will the outflow from the SUDS would be;</li> <li>● Requests as many trees are retained as possible; and</li> <li>● Expresses concern if Option D for the A9/A96 is preferred as all traffic from A9 will be directed down Dell of Inshes and past Inshes Church and Wester Inshes residents already have difficulty exiting their estate.</li> </ul>	
<b>L Cloud</b>	<p>Concerned about increasing traffic on road next to Inshes Church due to increased safety issues for pedestrians travelling between the housing estate and the retail park – a convenient safe route is vital.</p>	<p>This comment largely relates to detailed transportation matters that will be considered further by the Council in progressing Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 and Transport Scotland in advancing the A9/A96 Connections Study. The active travel map in the brief however does identify a new pedestrian/cycle crossing between the housing estate and the retail park – the requirement for is dependant on the outcome of the transport studies.</p>
<b>D&amp;J Whillis</b>	<p>Several unoccupied sites at existing Inshes Retail Park.</p>	<p>The site of the former video rental store, an existing restaurant and adjacent vacant land within a southern portion of the retail park are now addressed in the brief. The site was not referred to within the issues and options paper mainly because it had an existing planning permission and was therefore limited opportunity for debate on the development of the site. However, given the wider public may not be aware of the extant planning permission and that the applicant has indicated to the Council that a new planning application may be submitted for the site it was felt beneficial for the site to be included within the brief. Furthermore, the brief requires that this site should be developed prior to the development of the Dell of Inshes which is intended to be an extension to the retail park. This gives priority to the development of the existing retail park, and therefore improving the amenity of this area.</p>
<b>C Dickinson</b>	<p>Requests the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Plan for parking of bicycles: force developers into providing proper facilities to match the target numbers of users, Tesco's already fails in this area;</li> <li>● Use of segregated paths for cyclists and pedestrians; and</li> <li>● Equal priority given by junction signals for cyclists and vehicles – cyclists should not have to wait for two green lights to make the same journey; notes this bias already exists at the new Inverness Campus road crossing.</li> </ul>	<p>Provision of cycle parking for new developments must be consistent with the Council's Roads Guidelines for New Development. The use of segregated paths is dependant on a number of factors, for example number of users, amount of space and resources available, as such it is not common practice for segregated paths to be provided as standard for new developments. Equal priority for cyclists and vehicles is a detailed transportation matter than will be explored in further detail as details plans are progressed are Inshes Junction Improvements.</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
<b>Scottish Natural Heritage</b>	Were pleased to be able to provide some informal comments on natural heritage features and opportunities in the area in the lead-up to this consultation. Pleased that earlier suggestions have been incorporated into the brief.	Noted.
<b>Sportscotland</b>	No specific comments. Requests that Council notes papers have been reviewed and that no impact on outdoor sports facilities has been found. Should any have been missed the Council must still apply with the provisions of Scottish Planning Policy in relation to loss of outdoor sports facilities as would the circumstances as set out in the Development Management Regulations under which Sportscotland should be consulted on planning applications affecting such uses.	Noted.
<b>GH Johnston Building Consultants Ltd</b>	<p>Concerns regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no obvious indication of link to/form the A9 (formally known as East Link); and</li> <li>• lack of joined up thinking over the proposals with those of Transport Scotland - link into the new over-sized roundabout to the north east of Woodgrove is not well founded and will impact significantly on the residential amenity of those living there and at Dell of Inshes.</li> </ul>	<p>The brief contains clearer diagrams that highlight the location of the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connection Study route options where they lie within partially within the brief area. The route options are indicated both on the opportunities overview figure and the design guidelines for Dell of Inshes. However, given that these routes are at the options stage there cannot be any requirement for the land to be safeguarded at this stage.</p> <p>The Council have worked closely with Transport Scotland in preparing their respective transport proposals. Dependant on the route option chosen by Transport Scotland it may result in increased level of traffic passing residential areas. These potential impacts have been highlighted in the Council's formal response to Transport Scotland. The Council expects full consideration will be given to these potential impacts and potential mitigation by Transport Scotland in the selection of a preferred route.</p>
<b>A Owens</b>	<p>Any of the chosen routes will be very busy with complex junctions and therefore must provide the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all new traffic signs must comply with the Department for Transport Traffic Signs Regulations which state that 'The legibility of traffic signs is of prime importance and where lettering has to be used, the message needs to be condensed into as few immediately comprehensible words as possible'; and</li> <li>• Bilingual signs should therefore not be erected anywhere in this area as it has been proved that displaying unnecessary words on signs can render them to be unfit for purpose and makes them much more expensive which cannot be justified, particularly at a time when public expenditure is being cut so drastically.</li> </ul>	This comment relates to detailed transportation matters that will be considered further by the Council in progressing Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 and Transport Scotland in advancing the A9/A96 Connections Study.

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	The Scottish Government's and the Highland Council's policies which require all road signs in the Highlands to be bilingual should be reviewed urgently to ensure that all traffic signs on our dangerous roads will strictly comply with the regulations and that they must not be used for any other purpose.	
<b>B Hill</b>	Considers proposals are sound – Old Perth Road will be safer and traffic should flow better.	Noted..
<b>Graham and Sibbald (Acting on behalf on Mr &amp; Mr Grant)</b>	<p>Responding of behalf of client who owns land to the South of Police Scotland, welcomes preparation of brief. Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development brief boundary is extended on western side of Sir Walter Scott Drive to the roundabout at the entrance to Inshes Retail Park because it would mirror the boundary on the eastern side of Sir Walter Scott Drive; and</li> <li>• development brief includes timescale for the delivery of the junction improvements.</li> </ul>	<p>As outlined previously it would inappropriate for the brief's boundary to be extended prior to the outcome of examination of the Inner Moray Firth Proposed Local Development Plan.</p> <p>It is agreed it would be beneficial for the brief to include timescales for the delivery of Inshes Junction Improvements. However due to the layout of the Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 2 Scheme being linked to the preferred option selected by Transport Scotland in respect of the A9/A96 link, a detailed timetable for the project delivery can only be established on confirmation of a preferred route. Once the preferred A9/A96 route has been announced by Transport Scotland a paper on the Inshes Junction Improvement Phase 2 proposals will be brought to committee for approval.</p>
<b>D Donald</b>	Questions why it is called the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief when what is proposed will also affect residents in Westhill as Inshes is their main shopping centre. Considers planners are thinking in too tight a constraints and not considering the effects it will have on adjacent areas.	The brief is entitled the Inshes and Raigmore Development Brief because the boundary of the brief encompasses these areas. Whilst it is accepted that the impact of development proposed in the brief may affect a wider area it is considered the most meaningful title is Inshes and Raigmore as these are the areas of the city where physical change is proposed.
<b>Westhill Community Council</b>	<p>Refers to Inshes Junction Improvements Phase 1 – concerned that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• currently most westbound traffic at non-peak hours uses only the inner left-hand lane and vehicles in the right lane are often regarded as 'queue jumping' – suggests signage at advance of and at the junction, such as 'USE BOTH LANES' might help alleviate this;</li> <li>• much existing signage heading eastbound is difficult to interpret, particularly for those not familiar with the area; and</li> <li>• road markings cannot always be seen particularly in dark and/or wet conditions thus increasing the potential for accidents - a situation which is likely to become worse when the Campus opens.</li> </ul>	These comments refer to detailed transportation matters and will be passed to the relevant officers in the Council for further consideration..
<b>I Stewart</b>	<p>Suggest if Dell of Inshes is developed for commercial uses then:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• buildings should be restricted to single storey designs to keep low visual profile and minimise intrusion when viewed from the A9;</li> </ul>	The development guidelines in the brief require that the layout and massing of development at Dell of Inshes minimises impacts on key views from the A9 and that built form avoids encroaching onto the green edge of the site which is most visible from the A9. It is felt these guidelines are sufficient to

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provision for formal/indoor sports recreation should be made as this is much need at this location – i.e. the centre of Inverness' population.</li> </ul>	<p>minimise the impact of development on these views. Restricting building to a single storey is likely to severely limit the form of development on the site and possibly be unsuitable for the mix of uses supported.</p> <p>In terms of space for formal/indoor sports recreation, the nearby Inverness Campus which is due to open in 2015 will provide a range of new indoor sports facilities for the area. As such it is not considered necessary for new facilities to be required within the brief area.</p>
J Shankland	<p>Suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>more 'green areas' may be of more value than buildings - growing plants will absorb water and possibly reduce flood risk; and</li> <li>commercial developments should have appropriately sized parking areas.</li> </ul>	<p>The brief identifies an active travel/green network enhancement opportunities diagram where green space should be retained. The guidelines for the Dell of Inshes site require that attractive landscaping is provided that enhances quality green space.</p> <p>Levels of parking provided within new developments must be consistent with the Council's Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Development.</p>
F&T McWilliam	<p>Appreciate need to reduce congestion and improve Inshes Junction, but have several concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>why is Transport Scotland's A9/A96 Connections Study roundabout link at Tesco/lane to Dell of Inshes included in the Council's Outline Proposals when this link is not common to all Transport Scotland route options – suggests route options has already been prejudged;</li> <li>Enhancing Tesco/lane to Dell of Inshes roundabout link would result in significant disruption to the green wedge area at Dell of Inshes including a direct impact on at least 10 mature trees with preservation orders lining the lane;</li> <li>Tree preservation orders have been omitted in the 'Built and Natural Heritage' map; and</li> <li>Requirement to cover a large part of the Dell Burn would have a vast impact on local wildlife let alone the direct impact on Dell of Inshes properties.</li> </ul>	<p>The outline proposals for Inshes Junction Improvements illustrate an arm of the enlarged roundabout to the south east of the Tesco car park linking to the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study Routes C and D. Whilst it is appreciated that this may appear that the route options have been prejudged, it was important to show a connection at this location to ensure that the two projects were compatible with each other. The Inshes Junction Improvements project will be progressed to detail design stage following an announcement by Transport Scotland for a route preference, this will establish whether there is any requirement for the link.</p> <p>If Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study Route C or Route D is chosen by Transport Scotland the existing road will be required to be upgraded which may impact on trees which currently run parallel to the road. This, including the potential for mitigation, will be a factor in determining the route option selected.</p> <p>The presence of tree preservation orders within the brief area have been mapped based on Council data and in consultation with Council Forestry Officers. It is understood that the tree preservation order within Inshes Retail Park on the south side of Dobbies Garden Centre is the only tree preservation order within the brief area.</p> <p>The issues and options paper does not contain a requirement to cover a large part of the Dell Burn – rather an open flood attenuation is proposed at part of the Dell Burn, this is illustrated in the drawings in the issues and options paper.</p>
L Lee	<p>Requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retention of row of poplar trees on east side of Tesco car park – sometime get red underwing moths (usually found further south)</li> </ul>	<p>The trees on the east side of the Tesco car park are shown in the brief as green network enhancement opportunity. The guidelines for the Dell of Inshes site in the brief requires that visually attractive landscaping and improved wildlife habitats that minimise/compensate for any loss of existing</p>

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>and larvae feed on poplar and willow; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of wildlife corridors wherever possible, and increase biodiversity through habitat creation – e.g. wild flowers on roundabouts, planting native species trees for screening - makes it a better place for us to live, as well as for wildlife.</li> </ul>	<p>mature trees are provided at this location. Inshes Junction Improvements outline proposals illustrate a flood attenuation pond at the location of the row of trees. As part of the Inshes Junction Improvements project the Council will be examining in further detail potential impacts on trees in line with the Highland-wide Local Development Plan policies for development and woodland. It would therefore not be appropriate for the brief to require safeguarding these trees at this time.</p> <p>The brief supports the enhancement of green and habitat network enhancements throughout the brief area. This is illustrated in the development opportunities diagram and explained in further detail in the design guidelines for the individual development sites contained within the brief.</p>
<p><b>A Johnston</b></p>	<p>Considers any proposed development expansion of the Inshes retail park will only generate an additional burden on the existing road network.</p> <p>Considers that the Council have been influenced by a persistent developer at Dell of Inshes to incorporate this site in the Highland-wide Local Development Plan, changing its use from green wedge to commercial use. This decision was taken despite concerns from residents as site is surrounded by residential properties, field or local access roads.</p> <p>Notes requirements include production of masterplan and identifies required safeguards - concerned none of the safeguards have been demonstrated to have been considered in the information provided. Most notable is the absence of recent traffic survey information and lack of SEPA engagement to prepare a strategic flood assessment plan. This information is vital to determine the site constraints and limit the developable boundary for the areas under consideration.</p> <p>Furthermore the A9/A96 Connections Study by Transport Scotland is equally flawed because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it appears to utilise the same traffic data generated in 2009 and prior to many new developments taking place; and</li> <li>• notes the information was prepared as a strategic level</li> </ul>	<p>It is accepted that development of the site at Dell of Inshes will result in an increased number of vehicles in the area. The Council considers that the existing Inshes Roundabout is at capacity and in its current form cannot accommodate a significant amount of additional traffic. As such the brief requires that for the Dell of Inshes site to proceed it must be accessed from a new junction on Culloden Road. A transport assessment is also a requirement to accompany any future planning application.</p> <p>As explained previously in this report the development plan is the Highland-wide Local Development Plan. This plan allocates the Inshes and Raigmore area, including the site at Dell of Inshes for mixed use development – this therefore establishes the principle of development at the site. The brief requires land to be safeguarded from development that is shown in the Inshes Junction Improvements outline proposals which also include land for flood attenuation. The Council have also engaged with SEPA in the production of the brief, as outlined previously in this report. It is therefore considered that sufficient information is provided in the brief for constraints to be identified that indicate the availability of land for development.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Transport Scotland A9/A96 Connections Study and Inshes Junction Improvements are noted and will be considered further by the Council and Transport Scotland as their respective transport network studies are progressed. This may include additional traffic modelling.</p>



Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>assessment as it was generated to support the IMFLDP.</p> <p>For consideration of this development plan an accurate model is required and a transport plan proposed to address the future transport needs to at least the same time period as considered under the IMFLDP. Note the transport report generated for the IMFLDP identified future concerns with the Raigmore / Culloden road network and consideration of suitable investment is made once rather than the example of "Sir Walter Scott Drive" where failure to dual on construction and reliance on developer contributions has led to inconsistent road infrastructure and arguably the need to implement piecemeal improvements including the latest plan to upgrade the Inshes roundabout and Old Perth road connections.</p> <p>The "outline proposals" presented in the development briefing material indicate up to 5 signal controlled junctions from the Inshes A9 overbridge to the Fluke roundabout, likely to be issues with this because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• only short queue lengths are available and if not synchronised may lead to blocking of crossing traffic and subsequent short cycle times to clear right turning traffic; and</li> <li>• each junction would probably include a pedestrian phase on demand which would also increase the traffic retention period which would also need to be factored into the travel time improvements proposed.</li> </ul> <p>Currently only one pedestrian crossing at Inshes Roundabout at the B8082. Pedestrian crossings at the B9006 are a considerable distance from the roundabout but are heavily used to reach bus stops and Beechwood Business Park. Notes these pedestrian crossings are retained as part of the outline proposals. Use of these pedestrian crossings has a significant impact on traffic flows using the Inshes Roundabout.</p>	

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<p>Proposed elevated access road to the B9006 from Inshes Retail Park is within an area of flood risk which impounds annually, including at respondent's property, known as Fernbank – would increase the current risk of flooding to respondents property – unacceptable and contrary to aim of IMFLDP to not increase flood risk. Flood attenuation basin would impact attractive tree lined border to Inshes Retail Park and residential and agricultural area immediately east – contrary to proposal to safeguard key views.</p> <p>Concern regarding proposed revised access route to respondent property because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no recognition of the existing tree lined border</li> <li>• incline and an elevated embankment may result in potential loss of privacy and amenity.</li> </ul> <p>Link shown to connect to A9/A96 Connections Study route would destroy any remaining existing avenue of trees – this is contrary to the proposal to safeguard key views.</p> <p>Suggests alternative proposal for A9/A96 Connections Study which has been submitted to Transport Scotland - in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a partially submerged tunnel to carry the B8082 under the B9006 with the existing roundabout or signalled controlled junction above.</li> <li>• B9006 would remain elevated from the Inshes A9 overbridge and would allow a pedestrian underpass and increased culvert to be installed avoiding the need for a pedestrian crossing and flood attenuation systems respectively.</li> <li>• Slip roads from the B8082 would be accommodated on the approaches to the roundabout although this is practical South of the Inshes roundabout, on the North the Tunnel entrance may need to extend to the A9 slip road to allow access to the Beechwood business park above.</li> </ul>	

Customer/ Organisation	Summary of Comments	Recommended Response & Reasons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additionally if required an additional lane could be provided to the existing A9 Inshes overbridge and a dedicated South Bound access slip road similar to the North bound slip road formed to the Inverness Campus junction on the B9006.</li> </ul> <p>The benefits of this alternative proposal are that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Culloden road width could be locally increased to accommodate the local and trunk road traffic as it will accommodate the effect of the A9/A96 connection proposals without any need for another A9 crossing.</li> <li>• the alternative proposal also separates the current confluence of East/West and North/South traffic flow at a busy junction.</li> </ul> <p>Recommends that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• further traffic surveys are undertaken to determine the actual current demand and future modelling and a transport assessment is prepared.</li> <li>• a formal flood risk assessment is undertaken and strategic flood risk assessment is prepared.</li> </ul>	
<b>Pritchett Planning Consultancy (of behalf of SWIPPT)</b>	<p>SWIPPT agree with general approach for Dell of Inshes but is concerned regarding prescriptive nature of the guideline.</p> <p>SWIPPT is working with Tesco to ensure that accessibility and infrastructure improvements undertaken will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enhance overall accessibility in the area; and</li> <li>• create a development site which will enhance the overall appearance and functionality of the area.</li> </ul> <p>The new development should complete the commercial centre of Inshes. Commercial considerations should be allowed for and variations on development scenarios to ensure that as and when detailed designs are drawn up for road improvements, flood attenuation and commercial development, the brief can be complied with and the ultimate development supported.</p>	<p>The development brief is to provide detailed guidance for the delivery of development in the area including the site at Dell of Inshes, therefore, by its purpose it must be prescriptive to a degree. It is considered that the revised development guidelines illustrated in the brief promote key principles that could readily apply to a range of development scenarios whilst ensuring that new development delivers the range and quality of commercial development required for the extended District Centre.</p> <p>The Council is encouraged that SWIPPT is working with Tesco to develop potential solutions to infrastructure improvements in the area. The Council will continue to engage with key stakeholders within the brief area including SWIPPT in developing detail designs for Inshes Junction Improvements and finalising the development brief.</p> <p>It is agreed that the development of Dell of Inshes should complete the commercial centre of Inshes, however this must be alongside the provision of key infrastructure improvements.</p>